SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION
MAR 3 1933
NATIONAL MUSEUM

VOL. XX JULY-OCTOBER, 1920 NOS. 3, 4

UNIVERSITY STUDIES

PUBLISHED BY THE UNIVERSITY OF NEBRASKA

COMMITTEE OF PUBLICATION

F. M. FLING
P. H. FRYE
HUTTON WEBSTER
P. H. GRUMMANN
L. A. SHERMAN
M. G. WYER

CONTENTS

THE EMBASSY OF EVERAARD VAN WEEDE, LORD OF DYKVELT, TO ENGLAND IN 1687
James Muilenburg 85

LINCOLN, NEBRASKA

vol.20, no.1-2

is out of print

THE
UNIVERSITY STUDIES
OF THE
UNIVERSITY OF NEBRASKA

VOLUME XX

LINCOLN
PUBLISHED BY THE UNIVERSITY
1920

CONTENTS

Moore—Excitation Stages in the Open Arc Light Spectra... 1
Muilenburg—The Embassy of Everaard van Weede, Lord of Dykvelt, to England in 1687..... 85

University Studies

Vol. XX July-October, 1920 Nos. 3, 4

THE EMBASSY OF EVERAARD VAN WEEDE, LORD OF DYKVELT, TO ENGLAND IN 1687

BY JAMES MUILENBURG

PAGE

The Importance of Dykvelt's Embassy

Contemporary Estimate—Estimate of Historians..... 87

Development of the Crisis

The European Policy of the Prince of Orange—The Political Aims of James II—The Policy of Louis XIV toward England—The Approach of a Crisis in England, and William's Position..... 90

Dykvelt's Embassy Determined Upon

Fagel's Address before the States General—The Arrival and Reception of the English Envoy—The Reply of the Deputies to Fagel's Request..... 94

The Character of the Envoy

Burnet's Characterization—Fruin's Characterization—Dykvelt's Earlier Embassies to England..... 99

Attempts of Count Avaux to Prevent the Embassy

Avaux's Alliance with the Opposition—His Dealings with Albeville—Dykvelt's Successful Interviews with Albeville..... 102

Dykvelt's Departure and His Arrival in England

Early Successes—Instructions from the Prince—The Scottish Indulgence—The Envoy's First Reversal..... 105

The First Interview with the King

Dykvelt's Account of the Formal Reception—Dykvelt's Account of the Private Interview with the King..... 110

Later Interviews with the King

James's Efforts to Secure the Prince's Consent to Toleration —Dykvelt's Early Attitude to the King's Offer— Dykvelt's Change of Attitude to the Offer—James's Announcement of the Prorogation of Parliament and the Declaration of Indulgence 114

The Appearance of the Declaration

The Liege Letter

Dykvelt Presents a Copy of the Liege Letter to the King— Question as to Genuineness of the Letter—Resolution of the States General to Recall Dykvelt, and Avaux's Activity 119

Dykvelt's Negotiations with the Factions

The Second Part of the Instructions—The Whigs and Tories —The Catholics—The Anglicans—The Non-conformists —The Quakers 125

Dykvelt's Negotiations with the Leaders at the Court

Lady Sunderland—Lord Sunderland—Lord Churchill— Prince George and Princess Anne 130

Dykvelt's Negotiations with Leaders in Council, Church, and Parliament

The Shrewsbury Meetings—Earl of Halifax—Earl of Nottingham—Admiral Herbert—Earl of Shrewsbury—Earl of Devonshire—Earl of Danby—The Bishop of London —Edward Russell—Henry Sidney—Lord Lumley 136

Dykvelt's Negotiations with Other Personages

Rachel Lady Russell—Duke of Bedford—Rochester and Clarendon 147

Dykvelt's Negotiations with Ambassadors of the Allies

Count Kaunitz—Don Pedro de Ronquillo—Count of Adda .. 149

The Last Interview with James II

James's Reproof and Dykvelt's Defense—James's Letter to the Prince—Dykvelt's Departure, and a Period of Quiet 151

A Final Estimate

The Importance of Dykvelt's Embassy

The importance of the embassy of Everaard van Weede, Lord of Dykvelt, to England in 1687, has been variously estimated by the many historians of the Revolution of 1688. Bishop Burnet, who played an important rôle in all the counsels of William and acted as the spiritual minister to Mary, speaks intimately of the whole affair. He gives an account of the mission which purports to be as he had it from the envoy himself. In Burnet's opinion the embassy may from one point of view be looked upon as a failure, for its ostensible objects were not attained. But Burnet believed that the real significance of the embassy was to be found in "the management of instructions to the Parliamentary leaders" and that from this point of view the embassy was "more prosperous." A secret cabal, he says, formed under the direction of Dykvelt, "concerted such advices and advertisements as might be fit for the prince to know, . . . and upon these the prince governed all his motions." Burnet intimates that already at this time the Prince had in mind some "change in the face of affairs as would amaze all the world."[1]

Avaux, the French ambassador at the Hague, suspicious, crafty, and vigilant, seems to have noted the whole project of William at this time. Yet, he confesses many months afterwards, when the enterprise was on the point of taking place, that he could never understand how Dykvelt and the others had been able to establish in England a sufficiently large commerce for fomenting an uprising of so many different people or how they had distributed money for this enterprise without the King of England discovering anything of it.[2]

---

[1] Burnet, *History of His Own Time*, p. 452.

[2] Avaux, *Negociations*, October 21, 1688, vol. vi, p. 300.

"Je mandai au Roi que je n'avais jamais pu comprendre comment Messrs. Citters et Dickfeld, le Dr. Burnet et Zullestein, ont pu avoir établi et entretenu en Angleterre une assez grande correspondance pour fomenter un soulèvement de tant de différentes personnes, et qu'ils ayent même distribué de l'argent pour ce sujet, sans qu'on en ait pu découvrir quelque chose à la Cour de S. M. Britannique. C'est pourtant à leur cabale qu'on attribue ce que ce voit à cette heure: mais je suis encore plus surpris de voir que depuis que l'affaire est découverte, personne n'ait donné connaissance de ce comploit à S. M. Britannique."

Fruin, in his treatment of the period, has an interesting bit of evidence which comes to us from the post-revolutionary days. It shows how another of Dykvelt's contemporaries regarded him. Burnet, in the presence of the eminent Dutch statesman, Witsen, suggested that the people of England should erect a statue to Dykvelt for his services to that kingdom. Witsen replied that Dykvelt in his embassy had laid the foundation of the Revolution.[3]

Many statements of Burnet have led Dalrymple to believe that the Revolution was already contemplated at this time. A strangely enigmatic passage in one important letter in his Kensington collection drives him to the rather hasty conclusion that the affair of 1688 was fully designed during Dykvelt's embassy in London.[4]

Macaulay, not more careful but surely more prejudiced, says, concerning the Prince of Orange and the Revolution, "There is not the least reason to believe that he at this time meditated the great enterprise to which a stern necessity afterwards drove him."[5] The dictum of Ranke is as follows: "The letters which Dykvelt brought with him, though far from causing us to admit that an agreement had already been concluded, *yet comprise the germ of such an agreement.* (The italics are mine.) They rest on the presumption of an inward harmony, and agree with the religious and political attitude which the Prince had up to that time maintained."[6] Klopp is more concrete and specific: "With the decision to send Dykvelt the opposition of the Prince of Orange in England begins,—it is the offensive against King James."[7]

---

[3] Fruin, *Verspreide Geschriften*, p. 156, note 2.

"Burnet, die er over oordeelen kon, getuigde ten aanhooren van Witsen na de Revolutie, 'dat Dijkveld verdiende dat men in Engeland hem een standbeeld oprichtte om de diensten, die hij het Rijk gedaan had,' en Witsen self meende, dat Dijkveld in zijn ambassade 'de nooten van het geheele werk gesteld had.' " (Scheltema, *Mengelwerk*, III, 2e st., blz. 135, 139.)

[4] Dalrymple, *Memoirs*, vol. ii, Appendix to Part the First, p. 180.

[5] Macaulay, *History of England*, vol. ii, p. 844.

[6] Ranke, *History of England*, vol. iv, p. 331.

[7] Klopp, *Der Fall des Hauses Stuart*, vol. iii, p. 283.

"Mit dem Beschlüsse der Sendung von Dykvelt beginnt das Entgegen-Wirken des Prinzen von Oranien in England, die Offensiv-Stellung gegen den König Jacob II."

Mazure sees no definite conspiracy against James at this time in the minds of the opposition, but he maintains with emphasis that "the return of Dykvelt decided the fortunes of James II in fixing the resolutions of the Prince of Orange."[8] Foxcroft, who is warm in his approval of Mazure's estimate, ends his annotation thus: "Whether any suggestions of an ultimate intervention on his part did actually, at this period, emanate from the Protestant leaders, we cannot tell, but we may conclude, with little fear of error, that the possible advisability of such a course began to scintillate before the mind of the energetic Dutchman."[9]

The judgment of the Editor of Mackintosh's *History* is most interesting in consideration of his careful study of the whole Revolutionary period. His remarks form a conclusion to certain observations based upon the correspondence of D'Adda, the papal nuncio in London. Referring to Dykvelt, he says, "He left England for the Hague, charged with letters to the Prince of Orange from leading persons both Tories and Whigs, couched in terms so explicit *that they may be regarded as the first step in the conspiracy which produced the Revolution!*"[10] (The italics are mine.)

De Grovestins notes, perhaps from a study of Dalrymple's letters, that from this period there was established a regular correspondence between the Prince of Orange and the opposition.[11]

It is noteworthy, then, that the chief historians for this period have seen in Dykvelt's embassy to England the definite beginning and foundation for the Revolutionary enterprise. It is strange, indeed, that an event of such moment, which concerned the interests not only of England and Holland but of all Europe, should have been so neglected. But though these various writers agree as to the great importance of this mission, one will look in vain for an account of it.

---

[8] Mazure, *Histoire de la Revolution de 1688 en Angleterre*, vol. ii, p. 250.
"Le retour de Dykvelt décida la fortune de Jacques II, en fixant les résolutions du Prince d'Orange."

[9] Foxcroft, *Life and Letters of Saville, First Marquis of Halifax*, vol. i, p. 484.

[10] Mackintosh, *History of the Revolution in England in 1688, Continuation*, p. 460.

[11] De Grovestins, *Guillaume II et Louis XIV*, vol. v, p. 354.
"C'est à partir de cette époque que s'établit une correspondance régulière entre le prince d'Orange et l'opposition."

Development of the Crisis

The policy of William of Orange to maintain the balance of power in Europe, to champion the cause of the great allied powers whenever he saw it threatened, to preserve the honor and dignity traditional to the Orangist party became the birthright of the Dutch nation for the centuries to follow.[12] Hating the power of France with all his intensity of nature and unyielding tenacity, William made it the one aim of his life to humiliate that nation which was the irreconcilable foe of his household and the enemy of a terrified Europe. Incredible difficulties stood in his way, but his fortunes increased as he grew older. Already at the age of twenty-one, he was leading the troops of an almost united Netherlands against the disciplined and magnificently-generalled armies of France. The Perpetual Edict had been abolished in his favor, and he became Captain-General and Admiral of the Dutch forces, —titles and offices which were a source of trepidation to the De Witt party.[13] Phlegmatic and frigid in his appearance and

---

[12] Perhaps the most recent work dealing with the position of Holland among the world powers is that of Van Hamel, *Nederland tusschen den Mogendheden*, Amsterdam, 1918. This work shows by a review of past history that the logical place for Holland in the Great War was on the side of the allies. The author contends that Holland's position of neutrality was contrary to the characteristic conduct of his country during the past three centuries. It is emphasized that the foreign policy of Holland to join with the allied powers whenever she saw the balance of Europe disturbed, was the heritage from the house of Orange and particularly William the Third.

[13] Müller, *Wilhelm und van Waldeck*, p. 1 f.

"Doch eben weil eine von einer einzigen Triebfeder in allen ihren Handlungen beherrschte politische Thätigkeit so selten ist, ist auch der grosse Oranien so oft verkehrt beurtheilt worden; haben doch namentlich die französichen Schriftsteller, selbst die besten, wie Mignet, Henri Martin, Camile Rousset, ihn einer unermesslichen Ehr—und Herschsucht angeklagt, die ihm zu dem Streben nach dictatorischer Gewalt in der Republik, sowie nach dem Besitz der englischen Trone getrieben habe.

"Sie haben nicht eingesehen, wie er in dem Unterwerfung der Opposition der städtischen Regenten eben nur ein Mittel sah, die ganze Macht der Republik gegen Frankreich ins Feld zu führen zu können, wie er England erobern müsste, da es sonst unmöglich war, die Streitkräfte der englischen Land—und See Macht gegen Frankreich zu wenden, die diese Eroberung für ihn absolut nothwendig war, damit

manners, he possessed insight which made him the supreme diplomat of his time. And feeling what was for Europe the primary need, he saw that if ever he was to succeed in his life-purpose, he must become master of the power of England. Since the coronation of the Catholic king in Britain, national and international affairs were assuming an aspect so serious that William at the beginning of the year 1687 realized that if ever he was to win in his struggle against France, he must come to the foreground in such a time as this. He marched forward, coldly and determinedly, as the natural protector of religious liberties and the grand Paladin of Europe.

The Prince of Orange and James II had every reason for propitiating one another. The former hoped to win over his father-in-law to the side against France. So long as this seemed possible, he adopted a conciliatory attitude on every point but one. He was willing to consent to a toleration of popery only with the important (and ironic!) proviso *that it were proposed and passed in parliament.*[14] James II, on the other hand, desired but one thing of his son-in-law—and it was the one thing William could not give—consent for a thorough and absolute toleration of Catholicism, which meant the repeal of the Test Act and Penal Laws. The problem came to the fore in 1686 upon the mission of William Penn to the Hague. Although the Prince was willing to conciliate, the famous Quaker demanded, in the name of the English King, 'all or nothing.'[15]

At the beginning of 1687, James II had broken with the parliamentary leaders, who had done everything to avoid a rupture. They had rejoiced at his coronation, they had tolerated the Catholic worship in the royal chapel, they had even astonished the

---

nicht der Kampf gegen Frankreich mit der gleichen Fruchtlosigkeit fortgeführt werde, wie in dem ersten Coalitionskrieg und während des Widerstands gegen die Reunionen."

[14] Burnet, *History of His Own Time*, p. 441.

Foxcroft, *Life and Letters of Sir George Saville, First Marquis of Halifax*, vol. i, p. 477.

[15] Burnet, *History of His Own Time*, p. 441.

papal envoy by their cordial welcome.[16] The King, in his violation of the Test and his stubborn insistence to the Prince, had shown the latter that there was cause for apprehension. The Anglican clergy also were alienated by the unconstitutional acts of the King. Events had come to a turning point. James II had initiated a plan to introduce his religion into England. He sought to unite the Church of Rome and the Dissenters against the now hostile Anglican Church. He looked to Louis XIV as his great support.[17] There were many in the kingdom, as in all Europe, who suspected a second Treaty of Dover. The friendship of Louis XIV and James II proved to be an incalculable evil for both,[18] for Europe was the more ready to support the claims of William of Orange when it saw the chance of an Anglo-French alliance. And parliamentary England, aroused over rumors of a Jesuitical cabal, looked upon its king's alliance with Louis with little less than consternation.

The policy of Louis XIV towards England explains in a large measure the character of the diplomacy which forms the subject of this thesis. The French King had three main objects in view.[19] He encouraged James II in his attempts at extra-parliamentary government. Consequently, he sought to prevent all union between the Prince and the English King. He opposed anything which might suggest the possibility of national reform, for a change would be the chief aim of the leaders of the opposition.

---

[16] Ranke, *History of England*, vol. iv, p. 330–331, based upon D'Adda's correspondence to the Pope.

Macaulay, *History of England*, vol. ii, p. 918, based upon Barillon's despatch of May 2–12, 1687.

[17] Letter of Barillon, February 12, 1687, given as a note in Mackintosh, p. 259, which he himself found among the Fox Mss, 183.

"J'ai dit au Roi que V. M. n'avait plus au coeur que de voir prospérer les soins qu'il prends ici pour y établir la religion Catholique. S. M. B. me dit en quittant; 'Vous voyez que je n'omets rien de ce qui est en moi pouvoir. J'espére que le Roi votre mâitre m'aidera, et que nous ferons de concert des grandes choses pour la religion.' "

[18] Van Praet, *Essaies sur l'histoire Politique*, Guillaume III, p. 394.

[19] Ibid, p. 395.

Mazure, *Histoire de la Révolution en 1688 en Angleterre*, vol. ii, p. 194.

And lastly, he strove to keep England as far as possible from the coalition of Europe against France. Many of the apparently foolhardy actions of Louis are unaccountable except on the single assumption of Van Praet that he had little confidence in the fidelity of James.[20]

During the first weeks of 1687 affairs were fast approaching a climax in England. The highest places in the three kingdoms were in the hands of Lord Rochester, Lord High Treasurer of England, Henry Earl of Clarendon, Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, and the Duke of Queensbury, the royal leader in Scotland.[21] They were all strong adherents of the Episcopal Church, and did all they could to support it effectually. It was proposed to remove them. Sunderland was eager to get Rochester out of the way in order to work out his own selfish aims. Tyrconnel, who had gradually been endowed with greater powers in Ireland, soon displaced the less popular Clarendon.[22] Queensbury was easily deprived of his offices on account of his attitude toward the Scottish Proclamation. Moreover, James was encouraged in his plans to give the chief places in the country to Catholics, despite the provisions of the Test Act. Other dismissals followed. Officers in the army gave up their commissions, and Catholics were put in their places. The Prince of Orange was aroused from his silence. England saw only one gleam of light in the darkness of those untoward days.

[20] Van Praet, *Essaies sur l'histoire Politique*, Traite d'Utrecht et Négociations anterièures de Louis XIV, p. 92.

[21] D'Adda, the papal envoy sensed the popular feeling regarding the dismissal of Rochester and wrote to his master, January 10, 1687:

"Presentamente pare che gli animi suono inaspriti della voce che corre tra il popolo d'esser cacciato il detto ministro per non essere Cattolico, percio tirarsi al esterminio de Protestanti." (Mackintosh, p. 234).

[22] Fruin, *Prins Willem III in zijn verhouding tot Engeland*, p. 150.

"Hij verkoos, na eenige aarzeling, heen te gaan, en onttrok zoodoende het vertrouwen van een groote gematigde partij aan de regeering. Het ontslag van den anderen lord Clarendon, was nog ontrustbarender, omdat hij als lord-luitenant van Ierland werd opgevolgd door den Roomschen Ier, Tyrconnel, die reeds aan het hoofd van het leger daar te lande stond. Die vervanging deed vermoeden, wat ook waarlijk het geval was, dat de koning omging met het plan om het eiland geheel los te maken van Engeland, en bij voorbaat tot een wijkplaats in den nood voor zijn handlangers in te richten."

To it she looked for guidance, and in it she found her only hope of rescue.

When James attempted to control the elections at the Universities, to deprive the Church of its immemorial rights, and to dispossess men of their rightful holdings by force, the hitherto compliant conduct of the clergy and the Church party came to an end. Bishop Burnet, who was in especially close touch with the court at the Hague at this time, tells of the many "very pressing messages to the Prince of Orange, desiring he would interpose and espouse the concerns of the Church, and that he would break upon it, if the King would not redress it."[23] William held these letters secret, but he afterwards complained that many of those who were most eager to have him come over proved to be his worst enemies.[24]

Matters had come to a head both in England and in Holland. Still both sovereigns were hoping to avoid a break. But each had his *sine qua nihil*. In each case it was the consuming passion of the heart that was at stake. Diplomatic negotiations were opened between the court of England and the Hague. James sent over the worst possible diplomat to "manage the affairs." William also sent over an envoy. To give an account of this latter embassy to England, to relate how matters were concerted with all parties, to point out the significance of this mission is the purpose of this thesis.

Dykvelt's Embassy Determined Upon

On the fifteenth of January, 1687, Gaspard Fagel, the Pensionary, appeared before the States of Holland in the name of William, Prince of Orange.[25] It was a momentous occasion, for the rancor that poisoned the relationship between the States and the Prince had made the position of the government perilous. Fagel, who was a great statesman and a powerful orator, addressed the Deputies as follows:

[23] Burnet, *History of His Own Time*, p. 446.

[24] Ibid, p. 446.

[25] Kramprich's Report of January 20, 1687, as quoted in Klopp, *Der Fall des Hauses Stuart*, vol. iii, p. 279–280.

The condition of our foreign affairs inspires fears. The King of England is equipping a navy. The same is taking place in France. Our friends in England announce their fear that the preparation is directed against this Republic. The King, there, makes no secret of his dissatisfaction with us, partly because of affairs in the East Indies, partly because of the fugitive Englishmen here. In England, people are industriously looking up old claims, in order to molest the members of the Republic. The ambassador whom the King has promised to send has not yet come.

For all these reasons the Prince considers it necessary to send an extraordinary ambassador to England, who shall acquaint himself with the situation there; he shall further express to the king our willingness to live in peace and friendship with him, and at the same time receive reassurances that the King is of the same mind. By this embassy we at least give the open evidence that everything that can be done on our side is done.

This version of Fagel's oration is to be found in Klopp, who appears to have taken it from Kramprich's account of January 20.

Count Avaux, who had friends among the opponents of William and maintained spies in the Court, gives an account in greater detail. This war, he says, which Fagel apprehended, was to be declared in the spring. The King of France was to join James II with forty ships. The King of Denmark and the Elector of Cologne would take the side of Holland. Moreover, Fagel was as sure of an Anglo-French attack against Holland the next spring as he was of his own presence before the Deputies.[26] The pretexts, continues Avaux, for the embassy were as follows:[27] (1) England was putting to sea a large fleet; (2) the King of England was much aroused over the episode between the East India companies of Holland and England; (3) the King was dissatisfied over the warm reception Holland had given to the English rebels; (4) finally, the States continued to leave the old debts, which had been contracted before the founding of the Republic, unsettled.

The Deputies did not reply at once to Fagel's request. They wished to confer with their 'commitenten.' The popular disfavor towards the Deputies forced the latter to acquiesce in the request of the Prince.[28] Their selfish commercial desires made them

[26] Avaux, *Négociations*, January 16, 1687, vol. vi, p. 26.

[27] Ibid, January 21, 1687, p. 27–28.

[28] Klopp, *Der Fall des Hauses Stuart*, vol. iii, p. 280.

obtuse to the actual situation, and their opinions were 'quite contrary' to the Prince's.[29] It was several days, therefore, before the answer came.

On the seventeenth of January, two days after Fagel gave his address before the States, the ambassador of whom he spoke, arrived from England.[30] No one could have been less suited to the great task than was the English envoy, the Marquis d'Albeville. His real name was White. An Irishman by birth, he had been a Spanish spy and had been given his title "in lieu of money."[31] He had also been in the employ of France, and at the time of his appointment to Holland he was in the pay of Louis XIV.[32] Burnet calls him 'a most contemptible and ridiculous man, who had not the common appearances of decency or truth,' and 'a contemptible tool of the Jesuits.'[33] Avaux, with whom Albeville had agreed to act, had no faith in him and in his letters to Louis XIV branded him as untrustworthy, false, a traitor, and always open to bribery.[34] This was the man James II chose to act as a sort of missionary to Mary in order to win her, if possible, to the Catholic faith.[35]

The three immediate purposes of the embassy of Albeville were soon known.[36] Bishop Burnet was forced to leave the court although he remained constantly in touch with Dykvelt and Halewyn.[37] The Prince was assured that rumors to the effect that James was attempting to change the succession were groundless. And lastly, James demanded the return of the English officers involved in the Peyton affair.

---

[29] Avaux, *Négociations*, vol. vi, p. 26.

[30] Klopp, *Der Fall des Hauses Stuart*, vol. iii, p. 280.

[31] Ellis, George Agar, *The Ellis Correspondence*, vol. i, p. 76, note.
Burnet, *History of His Own Time*, p. 450.

[32] Avaux, *Négociations*, January 23, June 12, 1687.
Burnet, *History of His Own Time*, p. 450.
Barillon's despatches to the King, September 2, 23, and March 3, 1687, to be found in Lingard, vol. x, p. 137.

[33] Burnet, *History of His Own Time*, p. 450.

[34] Avaux, *Négociations*, February 13, 1687, vol. vi, p. 41 f.
Ibid, p. 43 f.

[35] Mazure, *Histoire de la Révolution de 1688 en Angleterre*, vol. ii, p. 186.

[36] Ibid, p. 187 ff.

[37] Burnet, *History of His Own Time*, p. 450.

The prime intent of James struck deeper than these minor difficulties, however. He knew very well that his son-in-law would be unwilling to act with him if he did nothing to placate him. In private conferences with the Prince and Princess, Albeville assured them that the King had no intention of wronging them in the right of succession,[38]—the King had something far more difficult with which to contend. He had to assert the rights of his crown.[39] The Test Act and Penal Laws were restraints upon his royal prerogative. They were unjust restrictions upon his liberties. Therefore he sought to win the support of his children, the Prince and Princess. He even suggested opposition to France as a boon.[40] It would be to the interests of William and Mary to support him.[41]

---

[38] Mackintosh, *History of the Revolution of 1688, Continuation*, p. 451.

"The statement of Burnet respecting the King's assurances, through D'Albyville, of 'not wronging the Prince and Princess of Orange in the succession to the crown,' is corroborated. Van Citters writes to the States, that the King, in the same audience in which he denied the alliance with France, repudiated with vehemence the supposition of his promoting his religion by defrauding his children of their inheritance.* At a subsequent period he repeated this assurance, in a holograph letter to D'Albyville, which that envoy placed in the hands of D'Avaux."**

* Dutch Political Correspondence, ubi supra.

** Négociations du Comte d'Avaux, 22 Av. 1687. Fox, MSS.

[39] Kramprich's Report of January 23, 1687, as given in Klopp, *Der Fall des Hauses Stuart*, vol. iii, p. 281.

[40] Klopp, *Der Fall des Hauses Stuart*, p. 281.

Burnet, *History of His Own Time*, p. 451.

The correspondence that James was keeping with the French court at this time makes it well nigh incredible that this bait, which he allowed Albeville to throw out, was at all genuine. The editor of Mackintosh states his opinion concisely, "There are strong grounds for pronouncing against the sincerity of James. He could not, without violences almost inconceivable, overcome his sympathies, and sever his conexion, religious, political, and pecuniary, with Louis XIV. It is true he was a conscientious religionist, but his political morality was like that of other kings and princes, and he would not scruple to deceive a son-in-law, whom with good reason he hated and feared. His proposition, then, of joining the confederacy against France, may be regarded as a lure to obtain the assent of the Prince to the repeal of the tests, for the purpose of ruining his credit in England." Mackintosh, *History of the Revolution in England in 1688, Continuation*, p. 456.

[41] Ibid, p. 281.

The Prince replied that no one was more opposed to religious persecution than he, but that he could never give his co-operation to the repeal of the Test Act. It was the only firm bulwark of the Church of England. Moreover, the Catholics were by nature unfitted for holding places of authority.[42] Again, the High Church had never opposed James up to this time, but had adopted a friendly and compliant attitude in all things. The King was advised not to antagonize them.[43]

The tone of the Prince was almost importunate. "If the King of England did not attack the Laws, he would be very happy within; proud, without; but the persistence on the former way would confirm the rise of the Republic."[44] Surely His Majesty could not blame the Anglican Church for insisting on a legal security for their religion.

The Princess was 'more intractable' than the Prince.[45] But when Albeville broached the subject of the Test to Fagel, the latter listened "with unbelieving ears." "The speeches sound very well," he replied, "but I tell you confidentially that in politics I think very much of the Roman Catholic doctrine of good works."[46] Kramprich, the imperial representative at the Hague who apparently saw some hope of England joining the coalition, spoke in favor of Albeville's 'offer.' Fagel, however, had penetrated more deeply into the motives of James. The King, he observed, is really struggling to transform the temporary truce into a definite peace in the interests of France, not realizing that this will make him an object of suspicion not only to the Republic, but to Spain and the Empire as well.[47] It is interesting to compare the embassy of Albeville with that of Dykvelt, which was just on the point of beginning. They form a study in

---

[42] Burnet, *History of His Own Time*, p. 451.

[43] Ibid, idem.

[44] Ibid, idem.

[45] Ibid, idem.

[46] Kramprich's Report of January 23, 1687, as given in Klopp, *Der Fall des Hauses Stuart*, p. 282.

[47] Ibid, idem.

contrasts. In many respects they are antithetical, yet from the similarity of their problems and the unchanged attitude of the two sovereigns they have much in common. Little wonder that Burnet, commenting at one stage on the proceedings at the English Court, wrote: "Thus Dykvelt's negotiation at London, and Albeville's at the Hague, ended without any effect on either side."[48]

The response to the eloquent request of the pensionary Fagel was not long in coming. To give some appearance of strength and independence, the Deputies did not reply at once, but referred the matter to their 'commitenten.' Ralph states that their decision came before the arrival of Albeville.[49] This is plausible, for the States had been made to believe that one of the chief reasons for the present embassy was the delay of the English envoy.[50] Moreover, it is further borne out by the evidence of the secretary's register in which the account is given under the date of January 15.[51]

The Character of the Envoy

Upon the decision of the States, Everaard van Weede, Lord of Dykvelt, was chosen as the envoy to England. No one was more fitted for the mission than he. He was well trained in foreign affairs. In 1672, at the time of the Dutch wars, he negotiated for the Republic in France. The French were amazed at the boldness with which he made his demands for justice upon every violation of existing treaties.[52,53] He had been taught in the school of

---

[48] Burnet, *History of His Own Time*, p. 452.

[49] Ralph, *History of England*, vol. i, p. 952.

[50] See Fagel's address, supra p. 11.

The chief argument of Avaux to the Deputies had been that the proposed embassy was merely a duplication of the work of Albeville. So long as Albeville did not arrive, the Prince's position was secure.

[51] Secretary's Record, January 15, 1687, printed in Fruin's *Prins Willem III in zijn verhouding tot Engeland*, p. 151, note 2.

[52] Burnet, *History of His Own Time*, p. 219. This passage is quoted in a revised version from a later MS by Burnet to be found in Foxcroft's "Supplement."

[53] *Mémoires de Gourville*, vol. ii, p. 91, note. "In 1679, after the Treaty of Nimwegen had been signed, Dykvelt was the Dutch ambassador to France."

John de Witt, but the popular reversion against the French party caused him to turn to the Prince of Orange with whom he was closely associated for the rest of his life.[54] William saw in Dykvelt a skilful diplomat who could help him work out the great aim of his life. Burnet has characterized Dykvelt thus:

> His great abilities, and the insinuating smoothness of his temper, he being perhaps the smoothest man that ever was bred in the commonwealth, procured him so many friends, that the prince was prevailed on to receive him into his confidence. He had a very perfect knowledge of all the affairs of Europe, and a long practice in the government at home. He is very fit for embassies, and it is believed that he loves them. He speaks long and slow, but with great weight; he is a man of a good understanding, and in his private deportment a virtuous and religious man, and a zealous protestant. In the administration of his province, which was chiefly trusted to him, there were great complaints of partiality, and of a defective justice.[55]

Fruin's characterization is enthusiastic:

> He was a born diplomat and possessed the art of listening in such a way that he understood everything, even that which one wished to conceal from him. He also had the knack of speaking so that he never said more than what he wished to be known. Above all, he was, by his manners as well as by his previous sojourns in England, preëminently fitted for this mission.[56]

Dykvelt had already been in England on several important occasions. At the close of the second Dutch war, he was one of three Dutch diplomats in London to negotiate peace.[57] Upon the accession of James, he was again sent to England with the congratulations of his government.[58] He had many friends there,

[54] Upon the accession of William to the throne, Dykvelt was sent from Holland as a representative of that nation. In 1689, William secured for Dykvelt the rank of "most favored ambassador." Dykvelt was occupied until the time of his death in 1702 sometimes on the field of battle, sometimes in the courts of the German princes, often on commissions from William to the Hague, and always on the great diplomatic enterprise, which has helped to give William III his standing as the consummate diplomat of his time. For Dykvelt's leadership at the Congress of Ryswick, see Coxe's *Shrewsbury Correspondence*, Grimblot's *Letters*, *Archief Heinsius*, and the *Denbigh Manuscripts* in the *Historical Manuscripts Commission*.

[55] Burnet, *History of His Own Time*, p. 219, as corrected by Foxcroft.

[56] Fruin, *Prins Willem III in zijn verhouding tot Engeland*, p. 151.

[57] Dalrymple, *Memoirs*, vol. ii, Appendix to Part I, p. 180.
De Grovestins, *Guillaume et Louis XIV*, vol. v, p. 352.

[58] Burnet, p. 416.
Avaux, *Négociations*, vol. iv, p. 304, p. 333; vol. v, p. 185.

and he was constantly in touch with what was going on in the great island nation.[59] James II knew his powers and excellencies,[60] and Avaux knew that he was one greatly to be feared.[61] The English king was not altogether unsuspecting of his designs,[62] and the French ambassador did all in his power to prevent his departure, even after the Provinces were sending in, one by one, their formal approval of his mission.

---

[59] The interesting discoveries of Mr. R. B. Knowles may be found in the manuscripts of the Earl of Denbigh, also in the *Historical Manuscripts Commission*, vol. vii, pp. 196–197 and vol. viii, p. 552. They are an interesting study in determining the character of a source. Moreover, they promise further results of especial significance for the period.

[60] Avaux, vol. vi, 41 ff, Letter to the King, February 6, 1687.

D'Adda's Report of February 7, 1687, as found in the appendix of Mackintosh.

"On the other hand, the personality of the ambassador Dykvelt was attractive to him. He is, continued James II, a man of experience and of deliberation. It is an advantage to associate with such personalities, who possess capability and understanding, who do not cling to the literal instructions of their ignorant sender."

[61] Avaux, vol. vi, 21 ff.

[62] In an interview with the papal nuncio, D'Adda, James II complained bitterly of the motives for which Dykvelt had come to England. The account is given in a letter of the nuncio to the Pope in the appendix of Mackintosh's history, under date of February 7, 1686–7. This may also be found in Klopp, p. 325.

How well James understood the situation may be gathered from this extract: " 'The pretext of the embassy,' he said, 'is to obtain enlightenment over the report of a secret engagement between me and France to the detriment of the Republic: the true purpose is the plan of the Prince again to get on a good footing with me, for he sees all his plans thwarted through the appointment of Tyrconnel in Ireland, through the dismissal of Rochester, and through my other measures. But his condition is, that I shall act according to his will, not as is proper, he according to mine. If he does not succeed in this, he will thereupon go forth, and form for himself a party at the court and in the city, to breed discord through the unfortunate condition of Parliament.' "

Letter of Barillon, 27 January, 1687, in Lingard's History, vol. x, p. 138, note 2. " 'Le Prince d'Orange', disait le roi, 'juge les autres par lui même. Il croit, parcequ'il à été d'avis de m'exclure, que le même dessein pourrait me venir dans l'esprit. Cependant ceux qui me connaisent, me croirent fort éloigné d'une pensée si injuste et si impracticable. Il prend la résolution de faire envoyer ici par les États un homme qui lui est entièrement affidé, par le moyen duquel il éspere fortifier et encourager tous ceux qui sont de son parti. . . . Il juge de moi par lui même. Mais il se tromp fort. C'est Dieu qui donne les couronnes, et mon intention est bien loin de rien faire contre la justice et le droit.' "

Attempts of Count Avaux to Prevent the Embassy

Jean Antoine des Mesnes, Count d'Avaux, was the crafty and far-seeing minister of Louis XIV in Holland.[63] He carried on his negotiations with the party opposed to the Prince of Orange. He saw that the star of the House of Orange was in its ascendancy, and he saw that the prestige and influence of the members of the Estates General had long since passed away. Ever since those eventful and momentous days in the summer of 1672, when the Netherlands stood at the parting of the ways, and then suddenly in a flush of fervor turned towards the Prince, the followers of De Witt had lost power. They had always been the great hope of French diplomacy. Louis XIV looked to the opposition for diplomatic victory, and Avaux was a good pupil of his master when he allied himself closely with the Deputies and sought their favor by flaunting before them the prospects of commercial benefits.[64] The fact that William was practically dictator of the country had not escaped his observation, but he still sought to do all he could to hamper the activities of the house of Orange.

When Dykvelt received his commission for the embassy to England, Avaux was aroused. He dispatched this letter to his master, the King of France:

> As for the secret instructions which Dykvelt has, they come solely from the Prince of Orange. No one else knows anything about them.[65]

A few days later, he wrote to the King[66] that he was quite confirmed in his suspicion that Dykvelt was sent to England with the Prince's commands to strengthen the Protestant party there. To that end Dykvelt was to concert measures with Rochester and the Bishop of London. In case he was unable to succeed in that direction,[67] he should make every effort to reconcile the Prince

---

[63] For an estimate of Avaux's character, see Critical Bibliography under *Négociations de Comte Avaux en Hollande.*

[64] Mazure, *Histoire de la Révolution de 1688 en Angleterre,* vol. ii, p. 182 f.

[65] Avaux, January 21, 1687, vol. vi, p. 29.

[66] Ibid, January 30, 1687, p. 36.

[67] Avaux is at variance here not only with Burnet, who wrote out the instructions, but with the actual negotiations which followed shortly after his letter.

with the King of England. There was more to be apprehended from the second part of the mission than the first, and it would be well for His Majesty, the King of France, to strive to prevent this embassy.

Avaux attached himself to Albeville as soon as the English envoy arrived. He reasoned with Albeville thus:

> What is the purpose of this embassy of Dykvelt but to unite the party of the Protestants and the Parliamentary leaders in opposition to the King? If the real motives of the embassy are those outlined in Fagel's address to the States, then it is quite superfluous for Dykvelt to go to London. The instructions of Albeville are to clear up all difficulties relating to commerce and religious differences. Moreover, Van Citters, the Dutch ambassador at London, is quite capable of carrying on the negotiations at the English court. There certainly is no honest reason for a special deputation.[68]

Albeville seemed to approve of Avaux's position. He promised to persuade King James to prevent the embassy. He begged Avaux to write 'in the same sense' to Monsieur Barillon, the French ambassador in London, in order that the latter might win over his confidant, Lord Sunderland, who stood very close to the King.[69] But Avaux suspected the sincerity of Albeville. He wrote to the King, his master, that even though Albeville gave him "the most beautiful assurances in the world, he nevertheless appeared to act a great deal with the Prince of Orange, and wished to please him."[70]

Surely, the French ambassador at the Hague had every reason to be disturbed. He saw that he was fighting a losing battle. The forces of the Prince gained daily in power. Dykvelt applied himself most assiduously to the task which had been given him. He was in constant communication with Albeville.[71] And the French ambassador saw plainly that the English envoy was playing into the hands of the Dutch. On January 30, he tells of a three hour conference that Albeville had had with Dykvelt and Bentinck, William's most trusted counsellor and friend.[72] In this conference

---

[68] Avaux, vol. vi, p. 35 ff.

[69] Ibid, p. 36.

[70] Ibid, idem.

[71] Avaux, vol. vi, p. 36, p. 43, p. 44.

[72] Ibid, p. 43.

Dykvelt had attempted to justify the past conduct of the Prince of Orange. He also stated to Albeville that he hoped to join himself to William Penn the better to gain the graces of the English King.[73]

In another conference with Albeville, Dykvelt asked many significant questions. He desired to know what complaints the King had against the Prince and who were the ones of greatest influence with the King to whom he might apply on the Prince's behalf. Would Sunderland be a suitable person, or could Albeville suggest others?[74]

As the time for Dykvelt's departure approached, Avaux's tone became bitter. He complains on the eve of the voyage that Albeville and Dykvelt were in close communication with each other. "For the last ten days," he writes, "they have been seen together at least once a day. I have even been informed that the last night that Dykvelt was at the Hague, the Marquis of Albeville was with him until midnight. The next day the English envoy was at dinner with Dykvelt and others who were in close touch with the Prince. Moreover, although Albeville appears very respectful to me, he neglects nothing that may put him in the good graces of the Prince of Orange."[75]

Dykvelt had daily meetings with the Prince and Bentinck.[76] Every morning from nine o'clock until noon was spent in conference. In the afternoon Dykvelt had appointments to fill at the Pensionary's and with a certain Alwin, whom Avaux describes as being in close touch with the most factious elements in England.[77]

Shortly before his departure, Dykvelt went to Amsterdam[78] to visit the leading men of the city. He assured them that he

[73] Avaux, vol. vi, p. 43.

[74] Ibid, idem.

[75] Ibid, p. 44.

[76] Avaux, p. 36 ff.

"Que depuis que l'envoi du S. Dykveld était resolu, le Prince avait été tous les jours en conférence avec Benting et Dykveld des neuf jours du matin jusqu'à midi, et très souvent l'après dinée, tantôt avec le Pensionnaire Fagel, tantôt avec Alwin, ce dernier ami intime du Sieur Frimans, et qui avait contracté par son moyen de grandes liaisons avec les plus factieux d'Angleterre."

[77] Supra, note 76.

[78] Avaux, p. 14, p. 38.

would do all in his power to further their interests with the King of England. It was a formality with which he could not dispense. These were the men who represented the great commercial interests, and he realized that their support was an asset to him.[79]

Dykvelt's Departure and His Arrival in England

Events conspired for the success of Dykvelt. Barillon worked diligently with Sunderland, but the latter was too crafty.[80] Louis XIV informed the English king of the Prince's hostile designs, but James II made little effort to prevent the embassy.[81] The men of Amsterdam were strongly pro-French, but they besought Dykvelt "to put them in a good understanding" with the King of England.[82]

News came from England at about this time which greatly strengthened national desire in Holland for an embassy. The English Parliament had been called to meet in February. If James permitted the meeting, it would be evidence to Holland and to Europe that there was no need to fear an Anglo-French alliance. If, on the other hand, the Parliament was prorogued, it would be evidence that national sentiment in England itself distrusted James. On January 27, Kramprich reports the prorogation of the English Parliament: "It was greeted with a general joy in Holland. It provided proof that the distrust of the King was paramount, and gave assurance, at the same time, that the King would spare no money in the completion of his designs. The King of France would supply James II with means."[83] The Prince of Orange now appeared as a champion of the Protestant religion and Parliamentary government.[84]

---

[79] Van Hamel, in describing this period in his *Nederland tusschen den Mogendheden*, calls it a "koopmansgeslacht,"—a generation of merchants.

[80] Ellis, *The Ellis Correspondence*, vol. i, p. 224.
Foxcroft, *Life and Letters of Halifax*, vol. ii, p. 27.
Mackintosh, p. 458.

[81] Avaux, p. 41 ff.

[82] Ibid, p. 14.

[83] Kramprich's Report of January 27, 1687, vol. iii, p. 284.

[84] Klopp, vol. iii, p. 285.

The futility of the embassy of Dykvelt so far as the States General was concerned has already been alluded to.[85] The instructions of the envoy from the Deputies were after the manner of Fagel's recommendations.[86] Dykvelt was to find out the motive of James's naval preparations. The difficulties of the East India Company were to be settled. Some provision should be made concerning the religious refugees in Holland, and negotiations should be opened concerning the old debts of Holland to England. But a more earnest strain was struck when the Deputies urged Dykvelt to dissuade the King from hostile designs against the Low Countries and to win for them the good graces of His Majesty, the King of England.

The instructions of the Prince of Orange to Dykvelt rested upon two essential bases.[87] The first was to attempt a reconciliation between the Prince and James II. Of course there might be insuperable obstacles. The King's insistence upon his right of dispensing with law, his notions about the royal prerogative, and his refusal to call Parliament,—these stood in the way. The second basis was much more clearly defined.[88] Bishop Burnet, who wrote out the instructions for Dykvelt,[89] gives them as follows:

> He was ordered to expostulate decently, but firmly, with the king upon the methods he was pursuing, both at home and abroad; and to see if it was possible to bring him to a better understanding with the prince. He was also to assure all the church party, that the prince would ever be firm to all the church of England, and to all our national interests. . . . Dykvelt had orders to press them all (the dissenters) to stand off and not to be drawn in by any promises which the court

---

[85] Supra, p. 15.

[86] Fagel's address before the Deputies, supra, p. 11.

[87] Mazure, *Histoire de la Révolution de 1688 en Angleterre*, vol. ii, p. 199.

[88] See note 67.

[89] Burnet, p. 450. "I was ordered to draw his instructions, which he followed very closely."

The Bishop could scarcely refrain from praising himself. It is interesting to note in what broad terms the instructions are given. The Prince had doubtless informed Dykvelt of many details in his frequent interviews with the envoy. The above assertion of Bishop Burnet is amusing when considered in relation with James's statement that Dykvelt was one of those ambassadors who did not cling to the literal instructions of their ignorant sender.

might make them to assist them in the elections of parliament. He was also to instruct them of a full toleration; and likewise of a comprehension, if possible, whensoever the crown should devolve upon the princess. He was to try all sorts of people, and to remove the ill impressions that had been given them of the prince: for the church party was made believe he was a presbyterian, and the dissenters were possessed with a conceit of his being arbitrary and imperious.[90, 91]

Despite all the efforts of Louis XIV and his ambassadors, Dykvelt sailed for England with the almost united support of his country. Avaux exerted every energy to prevent his departure; Barillon and the more skilful Bonrepaux busied themselves at the English court with Sunderland;[92] Louis warned the English king against the embassy.[93] But it was without avail. The departure of Dykvelt was an initial victory for William. Skelton, who had been the English ambassador at the Dutch court and was now serving at the French court in the same capacity, wrote to Sunderland on the first of February, 1687, as follows:

> Mons. de Croissy took notice to me of Mons. Dykvelt's going into England, and I find it is not approven here, fearing he does not design any good to his Majesty; and they hope the King will give them a short and speedy dismission.

In England, too, events favored the coming of Dykvelt. On February 12, a Proclamation of Indulgence was published in Scotland.[94] It was an indiscretion on the part of James, but he maintained that the laws of the preceding reign upon which his opponets so insisted had in reality been aimed by a factious Parliament against himself and not at all against the Catholics.[95]

---

[90] Burnet, p. 450.

[91] Mackintosh, *History of England, Continuation*, p. 454.

"One article only of Dyckvelt's instructions came within the legitimate range of the rights and duties of an ambassador; that which related to his course of proceeding with the King. The rest was warrant for improper practice with the King's subjects. But the nearest interests of the Prince of Orange were at stake; the subjects of James conspired with a foreign Prince for their laws and liberties; and in such a case men do not look very narrowly into the obligations of international and municipal jurisprudence."

[92] Mazure, *Histoire de la Révolution en 1688 en Angleterre*, vol. ii, p. 186.

[93] Ransome, *History of England*, p. 660.

[94] De Grovestins, *Guillaume et Louis XIV*, vol. v, p. 347.

[95] Ibid, idem.

Nevertheless, the Scottish Indulgence aroused the country. Pulpit and press began a widespread agitation. Halifax was most active with the Episcopalians in London, while Bishop Burnet met with the forces of the opposition in Holland. Everywhere Anglican doctors strove to stir the people,—Anglicans and Nonconformists. They besought the former to forget past injuries and to unite for defence against the papists. They pointed out to the latter that the Indulgence was really no favor at all because it was in actual fact a step on the road to Roman Catholicism.[96] The subsequent behavior of James and its effect upon the country is characteristically described by John Evelyn:[97]

> March 3, 1687: Most of the greate officers, both in the court and country, Lords and others, were dismissed, as they would not promise his majesty their consent to the repeal of the Test and Penal Statutes against Popish Recusants. To this end most of the Parliament men were spoken to in His Majesty's closet, and such as refused, if in place of office of trust, civil and military, were put out of their employments. This was a time of great trial, but hardly one of them assented, which put the Popish interest much backward. The English clergy everywhere preached boldly against their superstition and errors, and were wonderfully followed by the people. Not one considerable proselyte was made in all this time. The party were exceedingly put to the worst by the preaching and writing of the Protestants in many excellent treatises, evincing the doctrine and discipline of the reformed religion, to the manifest disadvantage of their adversaries.

Dykvelt arrived in England February 23, 1687.[98] His credentials from the Prince were addressed to Lord Halifax, but the latter stood in formal disgrace at the English court. This naturally prevented a meeting, but a letter from Lord Mordaunt helped to arrange matters:

> Many lords, but particularly my Lord Halifax, wished to wait on you. He wished to send his brother, Mr. Saville, with his compliments to you, who still

---

[96] Mazure, p. 213.

[97] Evelyn, *Diary*, vol. iii, p. 33, March 3, 1687.

[98] Ellis, *The Ellis Correspondence;* p. 242.

Dalrymple, *Memoirs*, Letter of King James to the Prince of Orange, February 18–March 1, 1687, from Whitehall, vol. ii, Appendix to Part I, p. 181.

The statement of General Viscount Wolseley in his *Life of John Churchill, Duke of Marlborough* that Dykvelt arrived in England only three days before his first audience with the King on March is quite evidently wrong. See *Life of Churchill*, p. 379, note 2.

retains his post, though in daily expectation of losing it, but he is in the country for two or three days. That is the reason why Halifax desired me to pay you his respects, and to tell you that he shall not wait upon you unless you consider it convenient.[99]

Another difficulty faced Dykvelt. The English king denied him a hearing.[100] It has been observed that James II was quite aware of the hostile designs of his son-in-law.[101] He was not inclined to greet with open arms the unwelcome messenger of that "arrant Calvinist," the Prince. Moreover, he held a weapon, which might serve as a most adequate defence. The States General had only recently passed a resolution which made the admission of ambassadors difficult. The other European powers had looked upon the move with disfavor.[102] The English envoy to Holland, the treacherous Albeville, had not yet been recognized by the States. James II took advantage of the situation. He refused to see Dykvelt until the Dutch body had given Albeville a public reception. William was compelled to request the States to reverse their ruling. They complied, and Albeville repeated in his address to them what he had assured the Prince and Princess in private.[103] He produced no marked effect.

He had been losing favor for some time, and the Prince was more popular than ever before. On the first of March James wrote to the Prince that Dykvelt might now have his audience when he pleased.[104]

The coming of Dykvelt caused no small stir in England.[105]

---

[99] Foxcroft, *Life and Letters of Sir George Saville, First Marquis of Halifax*, vol. i, p. 478.

The original of this letter may be found in the *Hist. MSS Comm. Report*, vol. viii, p. 559, Earl of Denbigh. It is without address, and is dated "Lundi Mattin."

[100] Russell, *Letters*, vol. i, p. 211 ff. Lady Rachel Russell to Dr. Fitzwilliam, February 18–March 1, 1687.

[101] Supra, note 62.

[102] Klopp, vol. iii, p. 285.

[103] Kramprich's Report of February 24, Klopp, p. 285.

[104] Dalrymple, *Memoirs*, Letter from King James to the Prince of Orange, February 18–March 1, 1687, from Whitehall, vol. ii, Appendix to Part I, p. 181.

[105] Ellis, *The Ellis Correspondence*, vol. i, p. 246, February 26, 1687.

Van Nyevelt, *Court Life in the Dutch Republic, 1638–1689*, p. 332.

There were many whisperings about the court.[106] It was understood that he was "a man of parts and integrity,"[107] but it appears that the people felt "that he might as well have stayed away for any advantage that he will have in his journey."[108]

The First Interview with the King

Dykvelt had his first interview with the English King at six o'clock in the evening of the third of March.[109] At the envoy's request, the audience was without ceremony.[110] The Count of Middleton acted as spokesman between the two.[111] Dykvelt presented his credentials, and the King accepted them without remark.[112] Dykvelt drove to the palace at Whitehall in his own coach, accompanied by his own servants.[113] The Master of Ceremonies of the King's bedchamber was in charge of these preliminaries, and the Count of Harram, the son of the Duke of Hamilton, received the envoy at the palace. As Dykvelt entered the room the King was standing, surrounded by about a dozen of his officers. He nodded kindly to the envoy, and Dykvelt felt encouraged. He introduced himself in a few words. The King listened in a friendly manner and showed many tokens of his favor. When Dykvelt concluded his speech, the King responded that he wished to continue the policy of his brother and to maintain the

---

[106] Ellis, *The Ellis Correspondence*, vol. i, p. 250 ff.
Russell, Lady Rachel, *Letters*, vol. i, p. 212, February 18–March 1, 1687.

[107] Russell, Lady Rachel, *Letters*, vol. i, p. 216.

[108] Ibid, p. 212.

[109] States General, 6929, Public Letter from Everaard van Weede to the States General, March 4, 1687, from London.
"Volgens hetgeen ich aen U Hoog Mogende met de laatste post den 28ste des voorleden hebbe geadviseert, heeft den Koningh tot mijne audientie gestelt gisteravond ten 6 uyren."

[110] Ibid. ". . . . dat ich deselve liefst soude neemen sonder ceremonie ende sonder character."

[111] Ibid.

[112] Ibid. ". . . . ende oversulx alleen met overlevering van mijn brieven van credentie, dewelche geene exprimeerde heeft Sijn Maj't de goedtheijt gehadt, van sulx te agreeren."

[113] Ibid. ". . . . in mijn eygen caros en onder het gevolgh van mijn eygen domestycgnen gebracht zijnde tot aen Whitehall."

good relationship between his country and the States. Upon his accession to the Crown, he had determined to observe and follow exactly the agreement between the States and his Kingdom. He was persuaded that his country and the States had a good understanding and that nothing need be feared. James further constantly reassured Dykvelt about the peace and tranquility of the other Christian countries. As Dykvelt was about to retire, the King bade him to his private chamber where he had several matters to take up with him.[114]

The above account is taken from Dykvelt's public letter. It clearly bears all the traces of a desire to please the people. Avaux secured a copy of this letter and sent it to his master, Louis XIV.[115] He saw very well that it was being used in Holland as an excellent bit of propaganda.[116]

In a secret letter, bearing the same date as the public letter above, Dykvelt wrote to the States General about the interview with the King in his private chamber.[117]

I was all alone in the Cabinet with His Majesty. He said that it grieved him exceedingly not to have been able to admit me to an audience immediately after my arrival. He rejoiced that some way had been found to give Albeville his public reception despite the resolutions of the worthy Deputies. He had hoped all the time that the matter would be adjusted. It was, in fact, of small concern, but all of the ambassadors had made a great deal of it and feared that it might cause the interruption of the ordinary affairs. For that reason he was desirous of recommending to their Highnesses the removal of that stone from the path.

Then His Majesty spoke freely about a sincere friendship and correspondence with the States, and the good that both countries might receive from such amicable relations. It was his earnest intention and resolve to maintain such a relationship. His Majesty never had the intention to break with the States nor to declare war upon them. These were the rumors of evil-minded persons. His fleet was in a very bad condition, unfit to do service in case of need. For that reason he desired

---

[114] States General, 6929, Public Letter from Everaard van Weede to the States General, March 4, 1687, from London.

[115] Avaux, March 13, 1687, vol. vi, p. 47 ff.

[116] Ibid, idem.

"On ne l'avait pas tenue secrète, parcequ'on était bien aise de faire voir au public toutes les marques et toutes les assurances d'affection pour les États, et de conférence pour le Sieur Dykveld, que le Roi d'Angleterre avait données."

[117] States General, 7335, Secret Letter from Everaard van Weede to the Secretary of the States General, from London, March 4, 1687.

to make provision for its improvement. Since the beginning of his rule, he had discharged the old commission, to whom this work had been intrusted, and had appointed others, who, under the supervision of His Majesty, performed their duty more satisfactorily. The fleet ought by this time to be in a pretty fair condition.

His field troops were also reorganized. Both the repair to the fleet and the reorganization of the army had served to maintain peace and tranquility. He should be glad if the States would do the same thing on land and sea. But His Majesty would grieve if such actions would be taken as a precaution against him because he did not have the slightest intention of declaring war against our land.

Here, again, Dykvelt sought to win the favor of the Deputies. He had heeded their request to find out exactly the attitude of the English King towards them. On the sixth of March, Citters, the regular Dutch ambassador at the English court, wrote to the States that the King of England was extremely pleased with them. Moreover, he was now entirely undeceived of his bad impressions. He no longer believed they had sent Dykvelt to England to put him at odds with Parliament.[118]

According to a letter of Rachel Lady Russell, the private conference lasted a half hour;[119] according to a letter of Ellis a few days later, it lasted an hour.[120] The discrepancy is slight. The account of Mackintosh,[121] De Grovestins,[122] and others is misleading. Their implication is that differences of some moment arose in this first interview between the King and Dykvelt. With this exception, their story is the same as Burnet's.[123] The latter makes no specific reference to the time of the interview. He relates, indeed, the story of these differences, but they are given as

---

[118] Avaux, p. 46, March 6, 1687.

"Citters manda aux États-Généraux que le Roi d'Angleterre était extrêmement content d'eux, et qu'il était entièrement détrompé des premiers impressions qu'il avait eues que le Sieur Dickveld allait en Angleterre pour brouiller S. M. Britannique avec son Parlement." The Editor of Mackintosh found this letter of Citters' in the *Dutch Political Correspondence*. See Mackintosh, p. 455.

[119] *Letters of Lady Rachel Russell*, vol. i, p. 216, February 25–March 8, 1687.

[120] Ellis, *The Ellis Correspondence*, vol. i, p. 251.

[121] Mackintosh, p. 455. The Editor of Mackintosh clearly bases his account upon the story of Burnet.

[122] De Grovestins, *Guillaume III et Louis XIV*, vol. v, p. 353.

[123] Burnet, p. 451.

the burden of Dykvelt's negotiations with the King during many interviews. According to De Grovestins and Mackintosh, Sunderland was present at this secret audience. But Dykvelt, in his secret letter of March 4, states expressly that he was alone with the King.[124] Finally, it must be borne in mind that the conference lasted not more than an hour,[125] and it is not likely that the great religious problem was broached in the little time that remained after James's early conversation with the envoy.

The gracious disposition which James assumed in this early conference was by no means characteristic or sincere. Only shortly before, he was assuring Barillon of his attachment to the French king.[126] Moreover, his political movements were such as to inspire distrust and hate. On the fifth of March a letter from London described the state of affairs:[127]

> All goes red-wise; and it is the general opinion that Parliament cannot sit. The work of closeting, however, seems not at an end, but is directed where some place is rather aimed at, than any prospect of the business that is passed.

John Evelyn, commenting upon the new appointment in Ireland, bursts out as follows:[128]

> Lord Tyrconnel gone to succeed the Lord Lieutenant in Ireland to the astonishment of all sober men, and to the evident ruin of the Protestants in that Kingdom, as well as of its greate improvement going on. Much discourse that all the White Staff Officers and others should be dismissed for adhering to their religion. Popish Justices of the Peace established in all Counties of the meanest of the people; Judges ignorant of the Law, and perverting it—so furiously do the Jesuits drive, and even compel Princes to violent courses; and destruction of an excellent government both in Church and State. God of His infinite Mercy open our eyes and turn our hearts, and establish his truth with Peace! The Lord Jesus defend His little Flock, and preserve this threaten'd Church and Nation.

About this time Dykvelt was suffering from the gout, and he was unable to continue his work with customary assiduity.[129]

---

[124] Secret Letter, supra, p. 28. "In het cabinet met Sijn Majesteijt gansch alleen zijnde. . . . "

[125] Supra, notes 119 and 120.

[126] Supra, note 17.

[127] Ellis, *The Ellis Correspondence*, vol. i, p. 256, March 5, 1687, from London.

[128] Evelyn, *Diary*, vol. i, p. 635.

[129] Ellis, *The Ellis Correspondence*, vol. i, p. 251, March 9, 1687.

This was only a temporary indisposition, however, for soon he was very active in his negotiations. He held many conferences with the King.[130] And in these meetings, both parties sought that which was uppermost in the mind of each. The great problem centered about the ambition of James II to give the Catholics freedom of worship as well as civil and political privileges. If he were to do it with any measure of security, he knew that the support of the Prince was indispensable. In all these conferences with Dykvelt, James II sounded again and again his appeal for religious toleration.

Later Interviews with the King

The conferences which Albeville had with the Prince and Princess are very similar in substance to those of Dykvelt with the King. James II advanced the same arguments as Albeville for the repeal of the Test Act and the Penal Laws, and Dykvelt—this is Burnet's account—pressed the King with the same reasons that his master had employed with Albeville. James urged, moreover, the duty of respect for family relationships. He was the head of the family, and the Prince ought to comply with his wishes. On the contrary, the Prince had always opposed him in every point. Dykvelt could not agree. The Prince had carried his complaisance to the limit. In everything, he had shown a very ready submission to the King's will. But the matter of religion was a different thing. The Prince could scarcely sacrifice that. France had openly violated the articles of peace in the Treaty of Nimwegen, but the King had not intervened in the Prince's interests. Nevertheless, the Prince had kept silent and had made no protestations upon it. It was quite evident that he was willing to sacrifice his own concerns rather than disturb the King, his father-in-law. James made no answer to Dykvelt's speech.[131] But Sunderland and others of the ministry pressed Dykvelt to do all he could to bring the Prince to concur with the King's wishes. If the Prince would yield in the matter of the

[130] Burnet, p. 451.
[131] Ibid, idem.

Tests, the King would go into close measures with him against the King of France. Dykvelt replied—I continue to give Burnet's story—that the Prince could never make such a concession.

Unfortunately, the report of Burnet is subject to criticism in an important point. In the conferences both at the Hague and at Whitehall, he fails to draw any clear distinction between the Test Act and the Penal Laws. The Prince's response to Albeville implies the unwillingness of the former to favor any change in the law of England. But Burnet goes on to say that Dykvelt's speeches to the King of England were the same in substance as the Prince's and that he argued often with James.[132] Either the bishop was prejudiced by his clerical turn of mind and failed to give the account fairly,[133] or he was misinformed by Dykvelt. Don Ronquillo, the Spanish ambassador at the English court, tells us very clearly that Dykvelt was for a time enthusiastic over the King's intention to grant liberty of conscience.[134] The declaration which was to be published favored the Presbyterians more than any other sect, and Dykvelt was himself a Presbyterian.[135] Moreover, the Dutch envoy had been informed by persons in good standing in the Anglican Church that the present state of affairs could only end in England becoming a republic. He saw that this would be harmful to the Prince's interests, and for several days he was in great anxiety and acted as though this thing might happen on almost any day.[136] A few days later, Don Ronquillo

[132] Burnet, p. 451.

[133] Ralph, who is in most cases a faithful follower of Burnet, here describes the Prince as favoring the abolition of the Penal Laws, but not the Test. See Ralph, *History of England*, vol. i, p. 952.

[134] Letter of Don Pedro de Ronquillo to the King of Spain, May 26, 1687, from London. Received June 17, 1687. Appendix to Mackintosh, p. 698 ff.

" . . . le encontre el otro dia sumamenle preocupado de la libertad de conciencia que tanto havia aplaudido, . . ."

[135] Ibid.

" . . . pues dies dias ha establa muy contento da la libertad de consciencia, por ser los mas previlegiados en ella los Presbiterianos, que son se su mismo religion."

[136] Ibid.

" . . . diciendo que personas de bueno nota, y de la Iglesia Anglicana, le havian advertido que todo esto pararia en hacerse republica este reine despues de la

was surprised to learn that Dykvelt had undergone a radical change of mind. He was no longer content with the King's intention to declare a liberty of conscience. He told Ronquillo that his fears had been aroused by a group of Anglicans, but since then, both he and his master, the Prince, had been warned to place no trust in the King, for a deep-laid scheme was under way.[137, 138]

The statements of Don Ronquillo are corroborated by the letters of James to his ambassador at the Hague.[139] In a letter of April 1, 1687,[140] Dykvelt wrote to the Deputies that "the King, in his private cabinet, communicated to him his determination to give liberty of conscience in religion to all his subjects, in the manner of their High Mightinesses, adding many Christian and politic considerations and reasons, and stating that a proclamation of his intentions, provisionally to be inserted in the Gazette, was already drawn up in council." In this letter, Dykvelt does not mention "any objections made by him in his own name or that of the Prince."[141] It seems that the King's early prejudices against Dykvelt were removed, for he paid a

muerte deste Rey, y que quanto esto establa mas oculto le daba mas cuidado, particularmente haviondole un personaje Catholico insinuado esto como con amenaza: y que este era un cuidada que tocaba mas a los Estados que a nosotros, porque si esto succediere seria su ruina, y por la misma razon a nosotros no nos podia estar mal, respecto de que este reyno en republica dipenderia de Espana, y la de Olanda se perderia, . . ."

[137] Letter of Don Pedro de Ronquillo to the King of Spain, May 26, 1687, from London. Appendix to Mackintosh, p. 698 ff.

Mackintosh, *Continuation*, p. 456.

Dalrymple, Letter of Lady Sunderland, March 7, 1687, vol. ii, Appendix to Part I, p. 187 ff.

[138] The Editor of Mackintosh states (p. 456) that Dykvelt, in entering in with the King's views, departed from his instructions. The instructions, as they are found in Burnet, are too general to allow any such deduction. Moreover, if Ralph's statement is correct that the Prince was willing to repeal the Penal Laws, then Mackintosh is in error. From the sources I have examined and from the account of the Editor of Mackintosh, the latter's statement is an unwarranted assumption.

[139] Mackintosh, *Continuation*, p. 455. The Editor mentions three other letters: Avaux, April 22, 1687, in the Fox MSS, and two letters of Dykvelt in the *Dutch Political Correspondence*, March 4 and March 18, 1687.

[140] Ibid, p. 459.

[141] Ibid, idem.

very flattering testimony to the envoy's conduct on more than one occasion.[142]

The letter of Ronquillo to the Spanish king, the letter to Albeville, and Dykvelt's own reports to the States General,—these are quite convincing in their testimonies that Dykvelt did not argue so insistently as Burnet would have us believe, but on the contrary actually concurred for a time in the King's resolves. It must also be borne in mind that up to the very publication of the Declaration, Dykvelt appears to have had no great objection.[143] He did, of course, discuss the matter with the King,[144] and he even went so far as to suggest that the Prince's "adherence to the high Protestant party promoted the tranquility of the kingdom, and the interests of the Catholics themselves, by preventing the nation from proceeding to extremities."[145] It is worth noticing, then, that the boon that James held out, of co-operation with Holland against France, for a time gained ascendancy, and Dykvelt thought he was securing that which William of Orange most desired.

James II realized that he was holding out a most attractive bait when he suggested the possibility of an alliance with the continental powers against France. He had made the offer through Albeville,[146] and Kramprich, the imperial ambassador at the Hague, urged Fagel to grant James II the price he asked,—William's consent to religious toleration.[147] His proposal was repeated to Dykvelt, as we have seen. And it was not only

---

[142] Avaux, February 13, 1687, vol. vi, p. 41 f.

"Cependant je mandai au Roi que j'avais découvert par un entretien que j'avais eu avec l'Envoye d'Angleterre que Dykvelt était très agréable au Roi de la Grande-Bretagne."

D'Adda, February 7, 1687, Appendix in Mackintosh's *History*. Also quoted in Klopp, p. 325.

[143] The letter quoted in Mackintosh, page 459, bears the date of April 1, 1687. The Declaration appeared April 4, 1687.

[144] Mackintosh, *Continuation*, p. 460.

[145] Letter of Barillon, June 12, 1687, which the Editor of Mackintosh found among the Fox manuscripts. See note 4 of p. 460 of the *History*.

[146] Supra, note 47.

[147] Supra, p. 14.

Dykvelt who fell before James's strategy, but the other ambassadors of the allied governments also saw in the English King's offer the solution to their greatest problem.[148] On March 18, James wrote in most amicable terms to his son-in-law.[149] He was of the Prince's opinion that the peace of Christendom would be preserved for at least a year. He was also of the opinion, and had been "all along," that France would be quiet, "believing it not their interest to be otherwise."

In the same letter, James announced to the Prince that he had that very day prorogued Parliament until November 22.[150] He could not help seeing that he had nothing to hope from a body that was each day growing more hostile and antagonistic. But he did not intend Parliament to stand in his way, nor was he daunted by the Prince's refusal to co-operate with him in his plans for religious toleration. Apparently with the utmost unconcern and equanimity, he adds in the same letter of March 18: "That all my subjects may be at ease and quiet, and mind their trades and private concerns, (*sic*) have resolved to give liberty of conscience to all dissenters whatsoever, having been ever against persecuting any for conscience sake." On the same day, the King informed his Privy Council of his intentions to prorogue Parliament and to grant liberty of conscience to all dissenters.[151]

A letter from Count Avaux to his master a few days later is most significant. He informed the French King that Dykvelt's attempts to unite the Prince and James could only separate them because the designs of the English King to establish the Catholic religion could never harmonize with those of the Prince, who aspired to make himself the leader of Protestantism and King of England. Avaux adds that he had discovered that the Prince was having important conferences, during the last six days that he had been at the Hague, with the most factious of the English

[148] Dalrymple, Letter from King James to the Prince of Orange, May 10–May 21, 1687, from Whitehall, p. 164.

[149] Dalrymple, Letter from King James to the Prince of Orange, March 18–March 29, 1687, from Whitehall, vol. ii, Appendix to Part I, p. 181.

[150] See also *London Gazette*, March 21, 1687.

[151] Ibid, idem.

who were in Holland. And Bishop Burnet, whom the Prince had seemingly dismissed, was continually closeted with Bentinck.[152]

Were these conferences the result of James's letter of March 18? If so, did William begin to contemplate at this time the great enterprise which he carried out over a year later? Can this letter be termed the point at which the diplomacy of Dykvelt assumed a different character? These questions must for the present, perhaps, be left to the realm of conjecture, but the likelihood is exceedingly attractive.

The Appearance of the Declaration

On the fourth of April appeared the great Declaration of Indulgence.[153] It assured the Established Church the enjoyment of her legal rights. It annulled a long series of statutes and suspended the Penal Laws against all Non-conformists. Catholics and Protestant dissenters were given the right of public worship. The severe requirements of the Clarendon Code were done away with, and no religious assembly might be molested. Most important of all, perhaps, was the abrogation of the Test Act.[154]

The provisions of the Declaration appear today most laudable and praiseworthy. Some historians view James's Proclamation only in the light of our modern institutions. It must be remem-

---

[152] Avaux, *Négociations*, March 27, 1687.

"Je mandai au Roi qu'il était impossible que les démarches que M. Dykfeld serait pour réunir le Prince d'Orange avec le Roi d'Angleterre ne les désunit entièrement, puisqu'il était impossible que S. M. Britannique, dans le dessein qu'elle avait pour la Religion Catholique, ne demandat des choses au Prince d'Orange, que ce Prince, qui avait en tête de ce faire chef des Protestants, et de se montrer par-la sur le Throne d'Angleterre, ne voudra jamais faire.

"Je découvris que le Prince avait en de grandes conférences pendant les dix jours qu'il avait été à la Haye, avec les plus factieux des Anglais qui était en Hollande, et que le Dr. Burnett, que le Prince avait chassé en apparence de sa Cour, sur les presantes instances que le Roi d'Angleterre lui en avait faites, était continuellement enfermé avec Benting."

[153] *London Gazette*, April 4-7, 1687.

Ellis, *The Ellis Correspondence*, Letter to John Ellis from London, April 5, 1687.

[154] *London Gazette*, April 7, 1687, facsimile given in Macaulay, vol. ii, opposite p. 862.

bered, nevertheless, that almost every constitutional safeguard to the Anglicans was rendered nugatory.

The results of the Proclamation were soon evident. James did all he could to secure the thanks of the Protestant dissenters.[155] He assured the papal nuncio that the refugees would soon return, and there would be a consequent growth in trade and commerce.[156] The King graciously received all the addresses sent him from Presbyterians and Quakers, and he even went so far as to make public addresses to them.[157] But the Anglicans had done their work so effectively[158] that most of the dissenters were apprehensive of the ultimate results of James's toleration. Crowds gathered at the meeting houses, and affairs seemed to be in a critical way.[159] Evelyn was alarmed, and ejaculated with characteristic fervor: "What this will end in, God Almighty onely knows, but it looks like confusion, which I pray God avert!"[160]

The King was exceedingly aroused over the position of the Anglicans. "Is this your Church of England loyalty?", he cried out to the fellows of Magdalen College.[161] He had hardly expected them to show such opposition. He believed his Declaration would "resound through the country."[162] The resistance of the Anglicans, he thought, was an admission that the policy of liberty of conscience would work against their faith.[163] Sunderland joined the King against the High Church leaders. "Where is now their boasted fidelity?", he exclaimed. "The Declaration has mortified those who have resisted the King's pious and benev-

[155] Mackintosh, p. 291.

[156] Mackintosh, Report of Adda to the Pope, April 11, 1687.

"Mentre tanti che desertavano il paese per la persecuzione delle Anglibani se trova berosi stato di quiete e tranquillita per repatriari."

See also Appendix, Correspondence of D'Adda.

[157] Ellis, *The Ellis Correspondence*, April 30, 1687, p. 285.

[158] Avaux, April 24, 1687, p. 50 ff.

[159] Evelyn, *Diary*, April 10, 1687, p. 36.

[160] Ibid, idem.

[161] Mackintosh, p. 276.

[162] These were his words to the papal nuncio Adda, March 21, 1687, given in Mackintosh p. 276.

[163] Ibid, note, idem.

"Perche la religione Anglicana sarebba stata la prima a declinare in questa mutazione."

olent designs: the Anglicans are a ridiculous sect, who affect a sort of moderation in heresy, by a compost and jumble of all other persuasions; and who, notwithstanding the attachment which they boast of having maintained to the monarchy and the royal family, have proved on this occasion the most insolent and contumacious of men."[164]

James's high hopes for the Declaration refused to be disappointed. His cordiality to the Protestant Dissenters, as has been shown, was of little lasting effect; and his antipathy towards the Anglicans scarcely daunted that energetic party. But James continued in his belief (or was it mere pretence?) that the Indulgence was a success. On the twenty-second of April, he wrote to the Prince that the Declaration had produced quiet in his kingdom, "the generality of the nation being satisfied with it and at ease by it."[165] On May 20, he wrote again to his son-in-law after the same manner, stating that his declaration "had put people's minds much at ease" and that he had "great reason to be well pleased with having put it out."[166]

The Liege Letter

At about this time, a discovery was made which caused excitement among those who were closely concerned with the religious intentions of James. A letter, which the Jesuits of Liege sent to their brethren at Freiburg, told of James's great zeal for the Catholic faith. Bishop Burnet, who received a copy of the letter from Heidigger, a famous professor of divinity at Zurich, summarizes the letter as follows:[167]

> The king was received into a communication of the merits of the order [of Jesuits]. He expressed great joy at his becoming a son of the society; and professed that he was as much concerned in all their interests as in his own: he wished they could furnish him with many priests to assist him in the conversion of the nation,

[164] Mackintosh, p. 276, note, April 18, 1687, also April 4, 1687.

[165] Dalrymple, Letter of King James to the Prince of Orange, April 20, 1687, from Whitehall, vol. ii, Appendix to Part I, p. 182.

[166] Dalrymple, idem, May 20, 1687, from Windsor.

[167] Burnet, p. 452.

which he was resolved to bring about, or to die a martyr in endeavoring it; and that he would rather suffer death in carrying on that, than live ever so long and happy without attempting it. He said he must make haste in this work, otherwise, if he should die before he had compassed it, he would leave them worse than he found them. They added, among many particulars, that, when one of them kneeled down to kiss his hand, he took him up, and said, since he was a priest, he ought rather to kneel to him, and to kiss his hand. And, when one of them was lamenting that his next heir was an heretic, he said, 'God would provide an heir.'

Dykvelt also received a copy of this letter, according to Burnet. He spoke very plainly with the King upon the latter's plans of converting the nation to the Catholic religion;[168] and when he mentioned the Liege letter, James asked for a copy of it. The King promised Dykvelt that he would read it to see whether or not it was an imposture to make him the more odious. But he never mentioned the letter to the envoy again.[169] Dykvelt considered that this was a confession that the letter was no forgery.

If the Liege letter is genuine, it is a revelation of the character of James II. The extremities to which it goes, however, rather incline one to view it with at least a measure of incredulity and suspicion. On the other hand, one can not believe firmly in the sincerity of James. It has been seen that his tone to the Prince was kindly. On May 10, he sent the following letter to William:[170]

Whitehall, May 10, 1687

I have had yours of the 13th, by which I find that you in Holland are not alarmed at the King of France's journey to Luxembourg. Those who are jealous of it, will, I am confident, be soon out of their pain. I suppose Mr. Dyckvelt will give you an account of two memorials have (*sic*) been given me, the one by the Count Caunitz, and the other by the Spanish ambassador, both of them to desire me to endeavour to persuade the King of France to let me be guarantee of the truce. You may be sure I will do my part to persuade the King to it, since nothing can contribute more than that to continue the peace in Christendom. I have not time to say more, but that you shall still find me as kind as you can desire.

At this time, nevertheless, James II was on the best of terms with Louis.[171] He had expressed himself enthusiastically to

[168] Burnet, p. 452.

[169] Ibid, idem.

[170] Dalrymple, May 10, 1687, from Whitehall, vol. ii, Appendix to Part I, p. 164.

[171] Van Praet, *Essaies, Guillaume III*, p. 394.

Barillon that he would omit nothing that was in his power to establish the Catholic religion, and he hoped that the King, Louis XIV, would aid him so that together they might do great things for their religion.[172] It is hardly likely that James had undergone a complete revulsion of feeling since the interview with Barillon less than two months before.

The Editor of Mackintosh in the Continuation pronounces against the sincerity of James:[173]

> He could not, without violences almost inconceivable, overcome his sympathies, and sever his connection, religous, political, and pecuniary, with Louis XIV. It is true he was a conscientious religionist, but his political morality was like that of other kings and princes, and he would not scruple to deceive a son-in-law, whom with good reason he hated and feared. His proposition, then, of joining the confederacy against France, may be regarded as a lure to obtain the assent of the Prince to the repeal of the tests, for the purpose of ruining his credit in England.

The month of April, 1687, was filled with excitement. It had begun by James's inauspicious Declaration. The result was a bitter struggle between the King and the leaders of the High Church to gain the good will of the Protestant dissenters. Not only in England, but also in Scotland was there an intense rivalry.[174] In the courts, James's "closetings" had produced rancor and sharp antipathy. The struggle with the Universities also occurred during this month. The fellows were unwilling that their traditional rights and privileges should be over-ruled by a King who desired that Catholics should be put in the chief places. During all this time, Dykvelt had frequent interviews with the King, and continually wrote to the States General of the King's high regard for them.[175]

---

[172] Avaux, February 13, 1687, p. 41.

[173] Mackintosh, *Continuation*, p. 456.

[174] In February James had declared a freedom of conscience in Scotland. See Macaulay, *History of England*, vol. ii, p. 859 f.

[175] Burnet, p. 451.

Avaux, p. 49 ff.

"Le Sieur Dickfeld ne faisait qu'entretenir les États Généraux des conférences secrètes qu'il avait très-souvent avec le Roi d'Angleterre, et des assurances que ce Prince lui donnait tous les jours de son affection pour les États Généraux, et principalement pour le Prince d'Orange."

On the twenty-fifth of April,[176] according to Avaux, the States considered a resolution to recall Dykvelt, because they saw that his stay in England was useless so long as Parliament did not meet. But Dykvelt had been very active during the past weeks. This activity aroused the suspicions of the Deputies. The negotiations with James II had apparently secured for them the goodwill of the King, which was what they desired. What was the use of prolonging the embassy? Moreover, Avaux saw that Dykvelt was employing most of his energies in a cause which struck at France.[177] He used his influence with the Deputies against the power of Orange, which was directing its fiercest and most constant blows against his master, whose policy was the disturbing factor in the balance of power in Europe. He pointed out again and again that Dykvelt was mustering the Parliamentary forces about the Prince of Orange, that he was allying himself with the most factious elements in the island realm, and that all this was done against the English King and the States General of Holland.

Thus far, we have been introduced to the political situation with which Dykvelt was to deal in England. We have seen that the underlying meaning of the embassy lay in the shifting of the balance of power in Europe. The Prince of Orange was dexterously uniting the forces of Europe against France and her King. He felt, and felt profoundly, that he had come to the kingdom of the world for such a time as this. He saw, as did also his arch-antagonist, Louis XIV, that the struggle was to be fought, not on the battlefields of the continent nor yet on the highways of the seas in naval display; but it was to be fought in the court and councils of their island neighbor England. Thither Dykvelt, that consummate statesman, had been sent with special instructions from the national body of Deputies, and from the Prince.

---

[176] Avaux, April 25, 1687, p. 51 f.

"On prit résolution dans les États de Hollande de rappeller le Sieur Dickfeld et un des motifs qu'on en allegua, fut que puisqu'il n'y avait aucune apparence que le Roi d'Angleterre assemblat sitôt son Parlement, le séjour de Dickfeld en ce pays-la était inutile."

[177] Almost every letter he wrote his master repeats the danger of the Protestant alliance and Dykvelt's negotiations with the Parliamentary leaders.

We have noted the character of his negotiations with James, but we have also seen that these negotiations were not crowned with indubitable success.

Dykvelt's Negotiations with the Factions

The instructions which Dykvelt bore with him to England contained a most convenient alternative.[178] In the event that the King could not be reconciled to his son-in-law, Dykvelt was "to try all sorts of people, and to remove the ill impression which had been given them of the prince."[179] Besides the instructions, he carried with him letters of credit for the members of the Council.[180] Avaux naturally viewed all this in the most sinister light. He did not doubt that these letters were only a pretext for his speaking freely with all parties. He suspected that the conferences of the Prince with Dykvelt concerned designs with the most factious of James's subjects.[181]

Dykvelt did, indeed, obey the second part of his instructions religiously. He attached himself to the parties of church and council. "He desired that those who wished well to their religion and their country would meet together and concert such advices and advertisements as might be fit for the Prince to know, that he might govern himself by them."[182]

One of the most striking phases of the Revolution of 1688 is the attitude of the political parties in England. The Tories, traditional supporters of the royal prerogative, appear to have been more enthusiastic and persistent in the councils against the Catholic king than their opponents. The spokesmen of their party were Nottingham and Danby. The latter was most active in all the negotiations with Dykvelt, and his letter to the

---

[178] Supra, p. 22.

[179] Burnet, p. 450.

[180] Avaux, February 13, 1687, p. 43.

Mackintosh, Appendix, Report of Adda to the Pope, Sunderland speaks to the nuncio Adda about the letter which Dykvelt has for him.

[181] Avaux, February 13, 1687, p. 43.

[182] Burnet, p. 452.

Prince[183] is by far the most daring of all those that the Dutch envoy bore upon his return to Holland. It is singular to observe, moreover, that the Tory letters out-number those of any other party or faction. Macaulay remarks with justice that the most pressing calls to the Prince of Orange came from the Tories, "who, upon this occasion, discovered, that they and their opponents in party had hitherto differed, not so much about the right to resist, as about the degree of provocation which justified resistance."

Dykvelt's activity with the Catholics gives an insight into his character as a diplomat. When he arrived in England, he found them aroused over the King's dismissal of Rochester. They had seen that this impolitic move of the King had greatly exasperated the Protestants, and that the latter would now lay aside their non-resistance. It was clear to Catholics and Protestants alike that James was designing to expel all Protestants from office.[184] Moreover, the King's later "closetings" and his constant disregard of the Test Act and Penal Laws bred fear and consternation in the ranks of the moderate Catholics, who were content to live undisturbed.

By the time that Dykvelt approached the Catholics, the latter had already determined upon a course of action in a secret council.[185] If Dykvelt should make any overtures to them they would place before him the condition of a *sine qua non*. This was the formal consent of the Prince to the repeal of the Test Act and the Penal Laws. If Dykvelt argued that he could scarcely meddle with the affairs of England, they would respond to him that he might, nevertheless, intimate to the leaders of the Parliamentary party his position. Barillon, from whose correspondence the historian Mazure obtains the account, considered

---

[183] Dalrymple, Letter of Danby to the Prince of Orange, May 30, 1687, p. 194 ff.

[184] Mackintosh, Appendix, December 31, 1686–January 10, 1687; or page 233 ff. of the *History*.

"Presentamente pare che gli animi suono inaspriti della voce che corre tra il popolo d'e sser cacciato il detto ministro per non essere Cattolico, percio tirarsi al esterminio de Protestanti."

[185] Mazure, *Histoire de la Révolution de 1688 en Angleterre*, vol. ii, p. 199.

this expedient very clever, for it would throw the Prince into the necessity of refusing that which was proposed to him or of losing his credit with the factious Protestants. But Dykvelt refrained from disquisition and disputation. The King knew of the envoy's attempts,[186] "but he poked fun at the false advances Dykvelt made to them."[187] Nothing daunted, Dykvelt continued his conferences with the Catholics, and besought them to contribute "to the great work."[188] He demonstrated to them that James was going too far and too fast, that it was their part not to carry things to the extreme, for it would expose them to certain ruin. It was quite certain that the Protestants would sooner or later recover their authority. He spoke to them of Ireland where the affairs were already conducted to such a point that the Kingdom would soon be separated from England.[189] They answered him according to the agreement they had come to in their council. At another time, however, the moderate Catholics assured him that they were not at all opposed to the rights of the Prince of Orange.[190] In fact, they were fearful of the future and disapproved, even in the presence of Dykvelt, the measures of the court. Dykvelt, on his part, held out to them the boon of toleration when William came to the throne.[191] According to Bonrepaux, the special ambassador of Louis XIV in England, the Catholics were conciliated, and the most respectable (*sic*) among them declared that they were satisfied with what Dykvelt proposed, and that they would rather have a toleration secured by statute than an illegal and precarious ascendancy.[192] An adroit diplo-

[186] Mazure, quoted for the most part directly from the correspondence of Barillon, p. 200.

[187] Ibid, p. 200 ff.

[188] In the light of what follows, this "great work" evidently refers to a position against the aggression of France. See Evelyn, May 10, 1687, p. 36; also Mazure.

[189] Mazure, vol. ii, p. 218. Tyrconnel, the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, had deep-laid plans for the separation of Ireland from England upon the death of James.

[190] Mazure, vol. ii, p. 218.

[191] Ibid, p. 245 ff.

[192] Macaulay, vol. ii, p. 894. This is based directly upon a communication of Bonrepaux, September 27, 1687. The translation is Macaulay's.

matic stroke of Dykvelt's was his creation of a split among the Catholics.[193] He was able to inspire a hate towards France among one section of the Catholics, who evidently viewed their King with suspicion. This schism weakened the Court party, and the jeers of James proved to have little justification.

The rash steps of the King in disregarding the Parliamentary advance of a century proved too much for the Anglican party, who had favored his accession and had connived at his earlier indiscretions. We have seen the effect of James's dismissals. Many of the injured officers in the realm stood high in their support of the Anglican Church, which they considered a mighty bulwark for the safety and stability of the English government. Compton, Bishop of London, who had suffered from the rigor of James,[194] was the High Church leader of the opposition against the King. He was in touch with the Prince before the coming of Dykvelt, and he assisted the envoy to gain his party for the Prince. Dykvelt pointed out to the Anglicans that the Prince considered the maintenance of the Episcopal Church a necessary guarantee of loyalty. Their interest was, then, to unite with him, in spite of his leaning toward Presbyterianism because the heir-presumptive to the crown could not and would not favor the republican doctrines which had dethroned Charles I.[195] Surely this was a sufficient *coup*. The Bishop of London promised Dykvelt the support of the clergy if the Prince would do what he could to win over the Non-conformists to his side so that they might not ally themselves with the Court.[196]

The position of the Non-conformists caused no little anxiety to the parties pitted against the King. There was, indeed, great cause for apprehension. Since the Restoration, the Anglicans had frequently dealt with the Non-conformists in a high-handed fashion. One has only to recall the Clarendon Code

---

[193] Mazure, in summing up Dykvelt's activity with the factions, mentions only this phase of the negotiations with the Catholics,—the fact that Dykvelt had inspired a hate between the pro-French and anti-French parties.

[194] Macaulay, vol. ii, p. 900.

[195] Mazure, vol. ii, p. 246.

[196] Ibid, idem.

and the Test Act. Dykvelt met with the Non-conformists quite conscious of their grievances. He encouraged them by promising not only toleration but also comprehension.[197] Two considerations persuaded the majority of these dissenters to join the Opposition.[198] First of all, the cause for which they had left the High Church was that it was still too much like the Catholic. They could not consistently hope for any great benefits from a church which they regarded as Anti-Christ. Secondly, they saw that the feeling of the nation as a whole was against James. As soon as Parliament met, it was certain to reverse his decrees and to set safeguards against Catholic supremacy. They saw that behind James's amiability to them there lay the question of the liberties that had been established by law. In other words, James's apparent sympathy with them involved a breach of the law of the country.

The position of the Quakers is interesting. The King strove to win them over. William Penn, who was accused of writing the Declaration of Indulgence,[199] did all in his power to gain adherents to the King's policy.[200] In 1686, he had gone on a special embassy to the Prince of Orange to persuade him to consent to toleration.[201] He was not successful. In England, his efforts were also without result, except among his immediate followers. The Quakers accepted James's acts with adulation.[202] Dykvelt, in the name of the Prince, promised them full toleration when the Princess came to the throne, and he suggested incorporation with the Anglican Church if both sides could be brought to certain concessions.[203]

---

[197] Foxcroft, *Life and Letters of Sir Henry Saville, First Marquis of Halifax*, vol. ii, p. 480.

[198] Ransome, *History of England*, p. 655 ff.

[199] Ellis, *The Ellis Correspondence*, vol. i, p. 268 ff.

[200] Macaulay, p. 874.

[201] Burnet, p. 441.

[202] Macaulay, p. 874. For Penn's flattering speech, see *London Gazette*, May 26, 1687.

[203] Mazure, vol. ii, p. 249.

Dykvelt's Negotiations with Leaders at the Court

The really significant part of the embassy of Dykvelt concerns itself with his negotiations with individuals and certain small groups. In these negotiations we see him working persistently, skilfully, and carefully. It was not until the very end of his sojourn in England that he incurred the wrath of James. In his dealings with the factions, he was careful not to antagonize. And in his relations with the chiefs of court and council he conducted himself with dignity.[204] He kept "a great table."[205] Parliamentary leaders resorted to his home, and Dykvelt made the most of every opportunity.[206]

On March 7, a letter of great interest and import was sent to the Prince of Orange from Lady Sunderland.[207] After effusive apologies to the Prince for her boldness and an explanation that she was unable to send her message by Mr. Sidney,[208] she proceeds:

> Your Highness is not ignorant I am sure what endeavors have been used here to gain votes in Parliament for repealing the Test and Penal Laws, upon which, as I suppose you know, several have and do quit their places rather than submit to; which makes the Roman Catholics see that they are not like to carry it that way; which brings me to that which I think of importance you should know; that the last essay they will put in practice as to the Parliament, is to flatter Monsieur Dixfield with a great many fine things, that there shall be an entire union between England and Holland, nay farther, I am sure they intend to make you the finest offers in the world, as your having a full power in military and civil affairs by naming all officers; that Ireland shall be put into what hands you will; and for all this they ask you to bid Monsieur Dixfield, and Monsieur Citers declare in your name, that you with the Parliament would take off these laws, and that you think it reasonable they should do so.

---

[204] Evelyn, *Diary*, vol. iii, p. 37, May 2, 1687.

[205] Ellis, *The Ellis Correspondence*, vol. i, p. 288 ff.

"Dykvelt carries himself very high, and seems fondest of those that the Court think worst affected; keeps a great table."

[206] Evelyn, *Diary*, vol. iii, p. 37, May 2, 1687. In the account of Evelyn, Dykvelt protests against the French aggressions against Luxemburg. According to James's letter to the Prince of May 10 (supra p. 38), it appears that the Prince did not have any great apprehensions.

[207] Dalrymple, Letter of Lady Sunderland to the Prince of Orange, March 7, 1687, p. 187.

[208] Henry Sidney, later Lord Romney, was the brother of Algernon Sidney. He travelled widely and was well-known in the courts of Europe.

The Countess then reminds the Prince that the King is attempting to secure his written promise while the assurances of the English Court will be only verbal. Moreover, the Prince's consent to the repeal of the Test and the Penal Laws would create a feeling against him both in the Council and among the people. She then continues as follows:

But I have not apprehension enough of your being caught with these fine offers, so have given you this trouble. But how far the offers may touch the ambassadors I did not know, for I am sure there is no offers, nor no dangers, that will not be very artificially showed Monsieur Dickfield. For the last I am sure there is nothing they need apprehend; and I think the offers are full as slight: But a negotiation on any commerce of this kind cannot be to your advantage; but infinitely the contrary; which is the only inducement I have in sending this man with this intelligence, in which I have been so cautious that the bearer does not know he comes from me, or that he has any letter of mine.

There is a lengthy postscript to the letter which contains an illuminating reference to Lord Sunderland.

Some Papists the other day that are not satisfied with my Lord, said, that my Lord Sunderland did not dance in a net; for they very well knew, that however he made the King believe, he thought of nothing but of carrying on his business; there was dispensations from Holland as well as from Rome; and that they were sure that I held a correspondence with the Princess of Orange.

She tells how the letter was delayed for several days because she desired to answer the King with a free conscience when he should call her to account. An interesting feature of the postscript is its repeated reference to Mr. Sidney, who, as was well known, was the lover of the Lady Sunderland.

The above letter has been attributed by almost every historian to Lord Sunderland. Dalrymple suspects that the letter proper is the dictation of Lord Sunderland and that the postscript is the Countess's. This is a sound inference, it seems to me, because it is hardly likely that Lord Sunderland should know of the letter his wife was sending to her lover. The references to Sidney in the letter are incidental and of little import; those in the postscript are illuminating and material. Klopp believes the letter to be Sunderland's, mostly from the character of the minister. The editor of Mackintosh, with customary care in examination of sources, states that there is no direct proof that Lord Sunderland

dictated the letter but that the circumstances seem conclusive of the fact.

The point involved is no mean one. It casts much light upon the nature of the Revolution and the character of James's leading minister. It may explain William's later treatment of Sunderland, and perhaps furnish a point of view to the party politics of the time.

The solution may possibly be found in the characters of Lord and Lady Sunderland. According to Evelyn, Lady Sunderland was an excellent person, whose Protestant zeal was a standing reproach to her husband's apostacy.[209] The Countess wrote to him on one occasion concerning books which might be suitable for her charge, the Princess Anne.[210] Evidently, the latter did not hold her mistress in such high esteem. In a letter to her sister Mary, she writes the following description of the Countess:[211]

> His lady, too is as extraordinary in her kind, for she is a flattering, dissembling false woman; but she has so fawning and endearing a way, that she will deceive anybody at first, and it is not possible to find out all her ways in a little time. She cares not at what rate she lives, but never pays anybody. She will cheat though it be for a little. Then she has her gallants, though may (*sic*) be not so many as some ladies here; and with all these good qualities she is a constant church woman, so that to outward appearance one would take her for a saint, and to hear her talk you would think she was a very good Protestant; but she is as much one as the other; for it is certain that her Lord does nothing without her.

Certainly, this estimate of Lady Sunderland by the Princess is far from flattering. Nor does it accord well with the gracious words of the devout Evelyn. Moreover, Bonrepaux describes the Countess as familiar with intrigues of gallantry and politics,[212] and Kennet calls her a woman of subtle wit and admirable address.[213] In another letter to Mary,[214] Anne is even more sharp in her remarks concerning Lady Sunderland:

---

[209] Evelyn, *Diary*, vol. iii, p. 273. Quoted in Mackintosh, p. 456 f.

[210] Ibid, p. 424 f.

[211] Dalrymple, Letter of Princess Anne to Princess Mary, March 13, 1687-8, from "The Cockpit," p. 299.

[212] Bonrepaux to Seignelay, July 21, 1687, in Mackintosh, p. 457.
Avaux, May 20, 1688, vol. iii, p. 488.

[213] Kennet, in Mackintosh, p. 457.

[214] Dalrymple, Letter of Princess Anne to Princess Mary, March 20, 1687-8, from "The Cockpit," p. 301.

I can't end my letter without telling you, that Roger's wife [Lady Sunderland] plays the hypocrite more than ever; for she goes to St. Martin's morning and afternoon (because there are not people enough to see her at Whitehall chapel), and is half an hour before other people come, and half an hour after everybody is gone, at her private devotions. She runs from church to church after the famousest preachers, and keeps such a clatter with her devotions, that it really turns one's stomach. Sure there never was a couple so well matched, as she and her good husband; for as she is throughout in all her actions the greatest jade that ever was, so is he the subtillest workingest villain, that is on the face of the earth.

It would be quite consistent with the character of Lord Sunderland to dictate such a letter. While it has never been determined exactly to what degree James's chief minister was responsible for the revolutionary enterprise, even the most kindly-disposed historians give to him a character that is entirely self-seeking and unscrupulous.[215] At the time of Dykvelt's embassy, Sunderland was in the pay of France[216] and was a very close friend of Barillon, the French ambassador.[217] Yet, in July Bonrepaux wrote to the French court that Sunderland was already working in secret in the interests of the Prince of Orange.[218] Avaux, who was continually on the *qui vive* at the Hague, stated repeatedly after Dykvelt's departure that the Prince of Orange was privy to all the secret councils of James's cabinet.[219] It is very likely that Sunderland saw already in March, 1687,[220] that a great change would take place in the face of affairs before long. Consequently, he may well have written the letter to indicate to the Prince where he stood.[221]

---

[215] Hallam, p. 62 ff.

Mazure, vol. ii, p. 156.

See also Klopp, Macaulay, Ranke, and especially Lingard in his appendix to Volume x.

[216] Appendix to Lingard's *History of England*, Vol. x, p. 207, Note KKKK. Lingard states here that the payments and acquittances are still preserved.

[217] Bonrepaux, June 4, 1687, in Lingard's appendix to Volume 10, supra, note 216.

[218] Letter of Bonrepaux to Seignelay, in Lingard's appendix to Volume x, July 11–21, 1687.

[219] Avaux, May 20, 1688, p. 152.

[220] Klopp, *Der Fall des Hauses Stuart*, vol. v, p. 331.

[221] In the spring of 1689 Sunderland published a vindication of himself. Lingard, in a careful and convincing manner, discredits Sunderland's statements. See Appendix to Lingard's *History of England*, vol. x, Note KKKK.

Only shortly after the arrival of Dykvelt, Sunderland told the papal nuncio, D'Adda, that the mission was not expected to produce good effects for the Prince of Orange. Dykvelt had letters for him, he said, but had not yet presented them.[222] When James had his interviews with Dykvelt, Sunderland was frequently present, for Burnet tells how the minister pressed Dykvelt to concur in the King's desires, and even held out co-operation against France as a reward.[223] It is indeed a commentary upon Sunderland's character that at this very time he was receiving a pension from France, to last as long as James continued friendly. Sunderland sent a short and effusive letter to the Prince of Orange by means of Dykvelt when the latter was on the point of leaving the kingdom.[224] The obsequious manner of the letter was customary to the time, but to the suspicious there is something of interest in the wording.

> I received the honour your Highness was pleased to do me by Mons. Dickvelt with all the respect I owe, and will ever pay to your commands, which I shall, on all occasions, exactly obey. He is too well informed of everything here, to pretend to give you any account of what has passed since his coming; and if he does me right, as I doubt not but he will, he must assure your Highness, that no man in the world is with more respect and submission than I am etc.

Bonrepaux's statement regarding Sunderland's treachery shortly after Dykvelt's departure,[225] and Avaux's repeated expression of distrust and his assurances of complicity with the Prince of Orange[226] have caused many of the minister's admirers to give him a chief place in the Revolution of 1688. Wellesley, the author of *The Life of Churchill*, names him the most important actor in the Revolution conspiracy.[227] The vindication which Sunderland published of himself in 1689 has been ably discredited by Lingard.[228] However important one may think Sunderland's

[222] D'Adda to the Pope, Appendix to Mackintosh, p. 656.

[223] Burnet, p. 452.

[224] Dalrymple, Letter of Lord Sunderland to the Prince of Orange, May 28, 1687, from Windsor, p. 191.

[225] Mackintosh, *Continuation*, p. 458.

[226] Supra, note 219.

[227] Wolseley, *The Life of John Churchill, Duke of Marlborough*, vol. i, p. 381 ff.

[228] Supra, note 221.

rôle in the Revolution of 1688, one cannot, unfortunately, overlook his avarice, treachery, inconsistency, and lack of moral sense.

A figure quite as unscrupulous and far more base than the designing Sunderland, whom James had raised to a place of honor was Churchill.[229] He had risen from obscurity to eminence. At the age of thirty-seven years, he was a major general, a peer of Scotland, and commander of the Life Guards.[230] Certainly, he had James to thank for these favors. But his ambition was as inordinate as Sunderland's. Dykvelt had come to England with special orders to communicate with him.[231] It was a dexterous stroke of William. At the time, Churchill was holding no military post. The likelihood was that he would be quite receptive to any advances from the Prince of Orange. In this, the Prince and Dykvelt were not mistaken. Churchill's letter to the Prince of May 17, 1687,[232] is treasonable in its contents. It bears a sort of grim humor when one contemplates his character and his treachery to the King. He says with justice, to be sure, that he "cannot live the life of a saint." But he assures the Prince that he sets all things at naught "in comparison to the being true to my religion," and that he is resolved "if there be ever occasion for it, to shew the resolution of a martyr." In the light of the conditions in England at the time and James's extreme determination to give the Catholics their political freedom, the assurance of Churchill that the King may command him in all things but this (his religion) has but one interpretation,—that Churchill was pledging his support to the Prince against his own King. His insistence that in all other things the King might command him is undoubtedly a protection against himself, but it is a feeble one.

A far more cunning trick of Churchill's was his use of the Princess Anne's name. The relationship that existed between Anne and Lady Churchill is too well known to need elaboration

---

[229] For a good life of Churchill, read Wolseley, General Viscount, *The Life of John Churchill, Duke of Marlborough*, (to the accession of Queen Anne), 2 vols., London, 1894.

[230] De Grovestins, *Guillaume III et Louis XIV*, vol. v, p. 356.

[231] Wolseley, *The Life of John Churchill*, vol. i, p. 382.

[232] Dalrymple, Letter of Lord Churchill to the Prince of Orange, May 17, 1687.

here. The Prince of Orange was conscious of the connection. Dykvelt spoke with Churchill and won him over, as the letter of May 17 testifies. The latter uses the Princess as his shield, for he begins quite adroitly:

> The Princess of Denmark having ordered me to discourse with Monsieur Dykvelt, and to let him know her resolutions, so that he might let your Highness, and the Princess, her sister, know, that she was resolved, by the assistance of God, to suffer all extremities, even to death itself, rather than be brought to change her religion: . . .

The rest of the letter concerns only Churchill's attitude and states nothing further regarding the Princess.

In the negotiations with Prince George and Princess Anne, the forces of the opposition—of Louis XIV and his ministers—draw into close conflict with the Prince and his aides. Bonrepaux, a special envoy from France, sounded the Prince of Denmark and held out to him a tempting prize if the latter with the Princess Anne would change over to the Catholic faith.[233] There is no evidence that I can find which shows that George rejected this offer. On the contrary, he appears to have encouraged the French envoy.[234] But he was altogether wanting in capacity and "was governed wholly by others."[235] Anne, however, was enthusiastic in her support of Protestantism and the cause of the Prince of Orange and the Princess Mary, her sister. Many of her letters to Mary are given in Dalrymple's Appendix, and they always breathe a spirit of intimacy and staunch support.[236]

Dykvelt's Negotiations with Leaders in Council, Church, and Parliament

A most important phase of Dykvelt's embassy was his negotiation with a group of the political leaders in England. The account is given by Bishop Burnet as he heard it from Dykvelt himself.[237]

[233] Mackintosh, *Continuation*, p. 452, based partly upon a letter of Bonrepaux to Seignelay, March, 1686.

[234] Ibid, idem.

[235] Ibid, idem.

[236] This correspondence may be found in Dalrymple, Appendix to Part I, p. 297 ff.

[237] Burnet, p. 451 f.

He tells how these men, representing every department of national activity, "met often at the earl of Shrewsbury's."[238] A characteristic statement of Burnet follows this remark, and this statement has led to a great deal of controversy on the part of historians. He adds, then, that "there they concerted matters, and drew the declaration on which they advised the prince to engage." It has been shown how Dalrymple, too eager to accept Burnet's conclusions, has fallen afoul of the actual situation.[239] The Editor of Mackintosh doubts that these meetings ever accomplished anything so startling as Burnet tells us.[240] The personnel of these meetings made concert upon such a great consideration as a revolution impossible. Those whom Burnet records as attending these meetings are Halifax, Shrewsbury, Devonshire, Danby, Nottingham, Mordaunt, Lumley, Herbert, Russell, and Compton, the Bishop of London.[241] The inherent timidity of Nottingham and Halifax was always a hindrance. Halifax and Danby were political rivals.[242] Even the Bishop of London was reluctant in his avowal of the Prince's cause.[243] It was not until several months had passed that the dispositions of the men were to be noted. Only seven of the group were courageous enough to send the invitation which brought the Prince of Orange to England.[244] On the other hand, everyone who met at the home of Shrewsbury had a grievance. Some had lost close relatives during James's campaign to secure himself; others had been evicted from important offices. Halifax stood in formal disgrace at the court. Devonshire was suffering from a bitter insult. Compton had been deprived of his clerical post. The conferences at the Shrewsbury home had their import, and it is Mazure who gives a just estimate on this important phase of the revolutionary enterprise.[245]

---

[238] Burnet, p. 452.
[239] Supra, p. 4.
[240] Mackintosh, *Continuation*, p. 463.
[241] Burnet, p. 452.
[242] Mackintosh, *Continuation*, p. 463.
[243] Infra, p. 60 f.
[244] The invitation is given in Dalrymple, p. 226 f.
[245] Mazure, *Histoire de la Révolution de 1688 en Angleterre*, vol. ii, p. 220 f.

Dykvelt neglected nothing of that which could assure the interests of the Prince of Orange. He formed first of all a redoubtable opposition, and soon all those who had a political importance in the nation, united themselves and formed a sort of secret parliament where public affairs were deliberated upon. But following the expression of a just and profound historian *qui deliberant, desciverunt*, and they finally formed a real conspiracy.

Many of the letters which these leaders wrote to the Prince of Orange are printed in Dalrymple's famous collection. They indicate the degree of confidence that the leaders placed in the Prince. It is this correspondence which presents concrete evidence of the gradual growth of the plot until its culmination in the invitation of June 30, 1688.[246] It is significant to note that it was at the home of the earl of Shrewsbury that this invitation was drawn up.[247]

George Saville, Earl of Halifax, was in touch with the Prince long before the coming of Dykvelt.[248] It is true that he was not the most aggressive of the supporters of the Prince, but he was careful and discreet. His sympathies were strongly for William and the Protestant succession, but he hesitated to enter into plans when he could not foresee their outcome. His writings are an important part of the literature of the period. They are characterized by ready wit, insight into character, delicate observation of manners, and poignancy. He was active as a pamphleteer, and at the time of the Scotch Declaration of Indulgence he was active in resisting the policy of the King.[249] Dalrymple, hasty and too enthusiastic for a partisan cause, brands him "with that indetermination which commonly makes literary men of no use to the world." It is true that Halifax was fond of disquisition and that he often vexed the more radical of James's opponents. But at the time of Halifax's removal from office, James said to Barillon, "I do not suppose the king your master will be sorry for the removal of Halifax. I know that it will mortify the ministers of the allies." And James prophesied correctly, for the

[246] Dalrymple, p. 226 f.

[247] Burnet, p. 452.

[248] His letters in Dalrymple, p. 186, though they are written early in the year 1687, show an earlier acquaintance with the Prince of Orange.

[249] Mazure, vol. ii, p. 213.

news of the removal filled the ambassadors of the Empire, of Spain, and of Holland with dismay. We have seen what inconvenience it caused Dykvelt when he arrived in London, for it was to Halifax that the credentials were addressed. Louis, on the other hand, was pleased. It meant another blow against Parliament.[250]

Halifax and Dykvelt met each other frequently.[251] The negotiations between the two are not given in the letter of May 31. But as Halifax stated, Dykvelt was thoroughly acquainted with the situation and could disclose to the Prince all that was of importance. His tribute to Dykvelt is interesting, for it confirms Dykvelt's account to Burnet.[252]

> Monsieur Dykvelt will entertaine your Highnesse with all his observations, which he hath made with great diligence, having conversed with men of all complexions, and by that means he knoweth a great deal of the present state of our affayres. The opportunities hee hath had, will make him the more welcome here againe, whenever there shall be a fayre occasion of bringing him. His free way of conversing, giveth him an easier admittance than hee would have, if he was too reserved; and his being known to be a creature of your Highnesse, encourageth men to talk to him with lesse restraint.

Halifax continued his correspondence with the Prince after Dykvelt returned to Holland, but his letters indicate no radical championship of the cause which Dykvelt had organized in England. On August 25 he writes:[253]

> There is so little alteration here since M. Dickvelt left us, that I can hardly acquaint you with anything of moment which would be new to you. I have told Lord Shrewsbury my thoughts, who is very well able to improve and explain them to your Highnesse. It is not to be imagined but that a certain design will still go on; all that is to be hoped is, that it will be so crippled with difficulties it every day meeteth with, that it will be disabled from making so swift a progresse as is necessary for the end it aimeth at.

---

[250] Mackintosh, p. 285.

[251] Dalrymple, Letter of Lord Halifax to the Prince of Orange, May 31, 1687, p. 196 f.

[252] Ibid, idem.

[253] Dalrymple, Letter from Lord Halifax to the Prince of Orange, August 25, 1687, p. 207 f.

This last letter was carried over by Shrewsbury, and on September 1 another letter was carried over from Halifax by Zuliestein.[254]

An important characteristic of all the letters of Halifax is his constant concern over the meeting of Parliament. It is the burden of every letter. In his letters of December 7, 1686,[255] of January 18, 1687,[256] of May 31,[257] of August 25,[258] and of September 1[259]—all those included in Dalrymple's collection—the meeting of Parliament appears to be Halifax's great hope. This deserves more than passing consideration. It means that Halifax occupies an important place in the politics of the time. He stood for that which Louis XIV opposed most vigorously. We have noted the removal of Halifax and the joy it brought to Louis.[260] It is a concrete instance of the mutual hostility. Moreover, Halifax was not indolent. His frequent interviews with Dykvelt, his opposition to the King's declarations, and his correspondence with the Prince are important elements in this period of preparation for the Revolution.

Daniel Finch, Earl of Nottingham, was for a period a leader in the councils at the Shrewsbury home, but as time went on and the conferences developed into a conspiracy, Nottingham withdrew from his colleagues.[261] Burnet tells us that he "had great credit with the church party, for he was a man possessed with their notions, and was grave and virtuous in the course of his life."[262] This accords well with his letter to the Prince.[263] His chief interest appears to be the cause of Protestantism. There is nothing striking in the letter so far as the Revolutionary conspiracy is concerned.

[254] Dalrymple, Letter from Lord Halifax to the Prince of Orange, September 1, 1687, p. 209.

[255] Ibid, Lord Halifax to the Prince of Orange, December 7, 1686, p. 186.

[256] Ibid, Lord Halifax to the Prince of Orange, January 18, 1687, p. 186 f.

[257] Ibid, Lord Halifax to the Prince of Orange, May 31, 1687, p. 196 f.

[258] Ibid, Lord Halifax to the Prince of Orange, August 25, 1687, p. 207 f.

[259] Ibid, Lord Halifax to the Prince of Orange, September 1, 1687, p. 209.

[260] Supra, p. 54 f.

[261] Burnet, p. 486.

[262] Ibid, p. 485.

[263] Dalrymple, Letter of Lord Nottingham to the Prince of Orange, May 18, 1687, p. 192.

Admiral Herbert was also present in the councils with Dykvelt. The story of his interview with King James and his consequent dismissal is a vivid one. At the time of the "closetings," Admiral Herbert was secreted with James and was asked the usual question regarding his attitude to the repeal of the Test Act.[264] Herbert answered that his honor and his conscience would not permit him to make any pledge. James replied heatedly, "Nobody doubts your honor; but a man who lives as you do ought not to talk about conscience." Herbert was aroused. "I have my faults," he retorted, "but I could name people who speak much more of their conscience than I do and who live a life quite as dissolute as mine." The result was that Herbert was deprived of his office and became an enthusiastic supporter of the Prince and the Revolutionary movements. When the Prince came to England over a year later, Herbert was put in command of the combined Dutch and English fleet.[265]

Charles Talbot, Earl of Shrewsbury, was a convert to Protestantism at the time of the Papist plot.[266] His genial personality and his sound common sense made him many friends. He was the "only man of whom both Whigs and Tories spoke well."[267] Burnet says that the Prince was never so fond of any of his ministers as he was of Shrewsbury,[268] and the correspondence of William to Shrewsbury, long after he ascended the throne, shows the same desire to exalt him.[269] The letter of Shrewsbury to the Prince at the time of Dykvelt's departure has all the flourishes of the time, but it is nevertheless sincere in its style.[270] During

[264] Burnet, p. 428. This story is also given by Macaulay, vol. ii, p. 861, and by De Grovestins, vol. v, p. 347 f.

[265] Ibid, p. 492 ff.

[266] Ibid, p. 484.

[267] Ibid, p. 485, note summing up the memoir in Coxe's *Shrewsbury Correspondence.*

[268] Ibid, p. 484.

[269] For the extremely interesting correspondence between William and Shrewsbury, and especially William's constant urging of Shrewsbury to accept high political offices, read Archbishop Coxe's *Shrewsbury Correspondence.*

[270] Dalrymple, Letter of Lord Shrewsbury to the Prince of Orange, May 30, 1687, p. 197 f.

Dykvelt's negotiations with the leaders, it was the home of Shrewsbury that was the headquarters for the conspiracy. In September, Shrewsbury went to Holland to act as a liaison between the Prince and the Parliamentary forces in England.[271]

Of those who suffered from the rigor of James, few met with the bitter punishment of the Earl of Devonshire.[272] The latter had avenged himself against a certain Colonel Colepepper, who had grossly insulted him in the court. The result was a long trial which ended in a choice for Devonshire of a tremendous fine or imprisonment. Devonshire pleaded the privilege of peerage, but the King refused to recognize it.[273] Consequently, Dykvelt found a ready listener when he spoke to Devonshire. The latter wrote to the Prince that Dykvelt had acquainted him with the intentions of the Prince as to many things and that he would be glad to await orders at any time.[274]

There was no more aggressive personage in the councils of Dykvelt than the Earl of Danby. He had risen to a position of greatest eminence, and had fallen out of favor through his zeal for Protestantism.[275] He was the enemy of France, and Louis counted it not the least of his achievements that he had been able, with the efforts of the crafty Shaftesbury, to bring about his fall. Danby had suffered five long years of imprisonment.[276] It was Danby who communicated the Popish plot to the House of Commons, and it was Danby who brought about the marriage of the Prince of Orange with Princess Mary.[277] Even after the imprisonment, Danby was active. The Tories made him spokes-

---

[271] Burnet, p. 486 f.
Dalrymple, Letter of Lord Halifax to the Prince of Orange, September 1, 1687, p. 209.

[272] Mackintosh, *Continuation*, p. 481.

[273] Macaulay, *History of England*, vol. ii, p. 896.

[274] Dalrymple, Letter of Lord Devonshire to the Prince of Orange, May 31, 1687, p. 198.

[275] Mackintosh, p. 286.
Macaulay, vol. ii, p. 894.

[276] Burnet, p. 306 and p. 383.

[277] Ibid, p. 271.

man of their party, and the Whigs remembered him kindly as the protaganist of Protestantism.[278] At the conferences with Dykvelt, Danby spoke for the Tories.[279] Surely, Dykvelt was able to find no one who was more fit to listen to his message from the Hague.

Danby's letter is the most interesting of all those that Dykvelt carried with him from England.[280] And it is the most enigmatic. The Prince of Orange especially directed Dykvelt to negotiate with the old minister of Charles II and the enemy of Louis XIV.[281] And Albeville may have given some suggestion too.[282] Danby speaks very highly of Dykvelt in this famous letter:

> I am therefore, in the first place, obliged to return your Highnesse my humble thanks for so great an honour, and next to do that justice to Mons. Dykvelt to assure your Highnesse, that as you could have employed nobody here who could have been more agreeable to your well-wishers in this country, so I am confident that nobody could have discharged themselves better than he hath done, both in his deportments to the King, and with all the satisfaction that could have been wished to those with whom he conversed concerning your Highness's great firmness in the Protestant religion. . . . By his prudent management of their discourses, he has done your Highness great service. . . .

Danby is sorry that Dykvelt cannot bring a better account of the services of the leaders during his stay, "but you know that our present stations do render most of us but little capable of doing anything which can deserve to be thought considerable." But he proposes a personal interview of the leaders with the Prince, and

---

[278] Grew, E. and M.S., *The Court of William III*, p. 80.
Macaulay, vol. ii, p. 894.

[279] Grew, E. and M. S., *The Court of William III*, p. 80.

[280] Dalrymple, Letter of the Lord of Danby to the Prince of Orange, May 30, 1687, from London, p. 194 ff.

[281] The motives of Danby during his political supremacy were fundamentally at variance with the diplomatic policy of Louis XIV. The latter feared the Prince of Orange and Parliamentary government. He opposed the spread of Protestantism, and saw in Catholicism a possibility of cementing together the two countries. Danby secured the marriage of the Prince of Orange to Princess Mary, and was friendly to Holland. His constant defense of Protestantism won for him the support of the Whigs. Moreover, Danby was strong in Parliamentary circles, and naturally looked to many of the leaders for help during his long distress.

[282] Supra, p. 19 f.

in this proposal one is bound to read a significant aspect of the Shrewsbury councils.

I confess that could there be a convenient opportunity for some of us to have a personal conference with your Highnesse, that some overtures might be made which would be of use to your service, and I hope from these hands your Highnesse is well informed of their thoughts who are devoted to your service. For my own part, I am so tied to be of that number by what I have already done. . . .

The most enigmatic part of the letter, and a most material part, presents a question of grammatical reference.

I am glad to find that Mons. Dyckvelt, who is so able to serve your Highnesse, is so well established in your confidence, as I understand by my Lord Halifax, to whom you gave him such credentials as made me willing to speak much more freely with him than otherwise I should have done; but yet I must confess to your Highness (which I rely upon your justice to keep to yourself), that finding his Lordship who received those credentials not willing to impart some things to him which are not very proper to be written, I thought it less prudent for me to say to him all that I could wish your Highness were truly informed of. I say not this with the least reflection upon my Lord Halifax (who, I am confident is very zealous in your service) but to show our unhappiness, who dare not, by second hands, speak what was necessary for your knowledge.

Are we to infer from this letter that Danby and others were reluctant in speaking to Dykvelt about their relationship to the Prince? Or must we conclude that Danby is casting a thrust at Halifax? It is well known, of course, that Halifax and Danby were political enemies. Moreover their personalities were very different. The inherent reticence and love of disquisition, so peculiar to the literary Halifax, was quite foreign to the persistent and ambitious nature of the conspiring Danby. Yet there are many indications in the above paragraph that Dykvelt is the person referred to. But why should Danby add that he means to cast no reflection against Lord Halifax?[283]

The letter of Compton, Bishop of London, which he wrote shortly after the departure of Dykvelt is hard to interpret in the

[283] This is, of course, a most material point. It concerns the very nature of Dykvelt's embassy, and the character of his negotiations with the leaders. Foxcroft, the writer and editor of *The Life and Letters of Halifax*, holds that the reference is to Dykvelt; the Editor of Mackintosh, it seems to me more plausibly, contends that the reference is to Halifax.

light of events prior to the arrival of Dykvelt and following the departure of the envoy.[284] The Bishop had been shamefully dealt with by James II. He had a cause for grievance. It was Avaux's constant suspicion that Dykvelt was to find a ready conspirator in the evicted bishop.[285] Yet, the letter which Dykvelt carried to the Prince, and those of September 5[286] and October 27,[287] show a conscientious allegiance to James II. Yet a year later, Compton was one of the memorable seven who sent the invitation to William.

Edward Russell, smarting under the cruel consciousness of a gross injustice to his family by the King, threw himself into the Shrewsbury cabal with characteristic enthusiasm. Burnet speaks of him as a man of courage, of much honor, of good principles.[288] But the description of Macaulay is more consistent with his deeds.[289] He tells us that Russell was a man of courage and capacity, but also that he had loose principles and a turbulent temper. He was a daring, unquiet, and a vindicative seaman. This man was eager to strike the blow which should bring William from the Hague. He went to Holland in April, 1688, and received the assurance of the Prince that the latter was willing to accept an invitation if it were extended to him.

Henry Sidney, brother of the famous Algernon, has already been spoken of in connection with his relationship to Lady Sunderland.[290] He was well known in all the courts of Europe, and he possessed a nature well-suited to a courtly life. He was graceful, Burnet tells us, of a sweet and caressing temper, he bore no malice; but the bishop reproves him for having too great a love of pleas-

---

[284] Dalrymple, Letter of the Bishop of London to the Prince of Orange, June 16, 1687, p. 199.

[285] Avaux, January 30, 1687, vol. vi, p. 36.

[286] Dalrymple, Letter of the Bishop of London to the Prince of Orange, September 5, 1687, p. 209.

[287] Ibid, Letter of the Bishop of London to the Prince of Orange, October 27, 1687, p. 211.

[288] Burnet, p. 485.

[289] Macaulay, vol. ii, p. 899.

[290] Supra, p. 47.

ure.[291] As the great scheme was progressing, Burnet relates that Sidney was "the man in whose hands the conduct of the whole design was chiefly deposited by the prince's own order."[292]

Lord Lumley, unwilling to yield to James's demands during the "closeting," resigned his commission as colonel of a regiment of cavalry.[293] There is no letter in Dalrymple's collection of Dykvelt letters from Lumley, but the latter was one of the chiefs in the great series of conferences. Burnet mentions him as a member of the Shrewsbury party.[294] In September, when Shrewsbury was leaving for Holland, Lumley together with Devonshire "undertook for the north" to prepare that part of the country for the schemes worked out by the cabal.[295] Evelyn gives an account of a dinner given by Dykvelt at which Lumley was present.[296] There is a letter dated May 31 farther on in Dalrymple's collection.[297] The year is not given. There is nothing in the letter which might not have been written a year before. Moreover, May 31, 1687 was just about the time that Dykvelt was leaving for Holland. In this letter Lumley offers his services to the Prince of Orange quite as effusively as the others of his party.

The last seven characters we have mentioned here—Shrewsbury, Devonshire, Danby, Compton, Russell, Sidney, and Lumley—these are the men who sent the invitation to William on that memorable day of June 30, 1688.[298] Their activity during the Dykvelt embassy and their receptivity to the proposals of the Prince of Orange through Dykvelt deserve especial recognition, for, as Klopp says, it was from this time that the great offensive was

---

[291] Burnet, p. 485.

[292] Ibid, idem.

[293] Luttrell, *Brief Relation of State Affairs*, 1678-1714, vol. i, p. 393, February, 1687.

[294] Burnet, p. 452.

[295] Ibid, p. 487.

[296] Evelyn, *Diary*, May 2, 1687, vol. iii, p. 37.

[297] Dalrymple, Letter of Lord Lumley to the Prince of Orange, May 31, p. 226.

[298] Ibid, p. 227. The signatures were given in a code of numbers. In the cabinet the key to these numbers and others was written in the handwriting of Sidney. Until the very end, it was uncertain just who would be willing to sign

launched against James which was to make him a refugee a little over a year later.[299]

Dykvelt's Negotiations with Other Personages

Dykvelt's visit to Rachel Lady Russell admits us into his character of adroit diplomat. The members of the Shrewsbury party seem to have thought highly of Dykvelt. He has already been characterized as knowing how to draw out information from someone else while giving none himself.[300] It was not that he was taciturn and reserved. The conference which Lady Russell describes gives another aspect to his nature.[301] Dykvelt came "to condole on the part of the Prince and Princess of Orange my terrible misfortunes." It was not a brief, formal expression of sympathy that Dykvelt presented. The Lady expatiates upon the interview. Dykvelt assured her "that if ever it came to be in their [the Prince and Princess's] power there was nothing I could not ask that they should not find content in granting." Dykvelt continued his condolences by telling Lady Russell all "the high thoughts the Prince always had and still preserved of my excellent Lord."

> And he said with protestation that he did so with design to make an agreeable compliment to me that he found the very same justice given to his memory here, and that so universal, that even those who pretended no partiality to his person or actings yet bore a reverence to his name; all allowing him that integrity, honor, courage, and zeal to his country to the highest degree a man can be charged with, and in this age, perhaps, singular to himself and he added at this completed with a great piety.

---

the invitation. Halifax and Nottingham could not bring themselves to perform the deed. The key was as follows:

Lord Halifax.....21	Lord Lumley.....29
Lord Nottingham.....23	Lord of Bath.....30
Lord Devonshire.....24	Bishop of London.....31
Lord Shrewsbury.....25	Mr. Sidney.....33
Lord of Danby.....27	Mr. Russell.....35

[299] Klopp, p. 283.

[300] Supra, p. 16.

[301] Russell, Lady Rachel, *Letters*, March 24, 1687, vol. i, p. 205.

Then Dykvelt gave a concrete instance of the great character of the Lord, and Lady Russell appears to have been pleased at Dykvelt's words. On July 12, the Princess Mary wrote a letter to Lady Rachel Russell thanking her for all the kind things the latter had said regarding the Prince and Princess of Orange.[302] On February 13, 1687–1688, the Princess wrote another letter to Lady Russell, which assured her of her kindly feelings and earnest desires to help.[303]

Another who was suffering from the death of Lord Russell was the father, the duke of Bedford, and Dykvelt bore assurances of comfort to him from his master. The result was that the old duke was deeply touched and looked kindly upon the designs of William.[304]

The policy of James, as has been noted, dealt severely with Rochester[305] and Clarendon.[306] The former sent his assurances of good will, but he made no definite promises nor did he enter into any details.[307] Rochester did more by his attitude of non-resistance to arouse the people against King James than he did by any active co-operation with the Prince. For this position of Rochester, William could never bring himself to favor the evicted Treasurer. Clarendon's letter is also non-committal, but it is interesting because of its enthusiastic praise of Dykvelt.[308] "Mons. Dykvelt will give your Highness so full an account of all affairs here that I need add nothing to what he is so well informed of," he writes, and then adds, "I shall only take the liberty to say

[302] Russell, Lady Rachel, *Letters*, The Princess of Orange to Rachel Lady Russel, July 12, 1687, from Honslerdyke, vol. i, p. 224 f.

[303] Ibid, The Princess of Orange to Rachel Lady Russell, February 13, 1688, vol. i, p. 238.

[304] His letter to the Prince at the departure of Dykvelt is contained in Dalrymple's collection, Appendix to Part the First, p. 199 f. The date is not given.

[305] Supra, p. 9.

[306] Ibid, idem.

[307] Dalrymple, Letter from Lord Rochester to the Prince of Orange, May 29, 1687, from New Park, p. 193. The letter ends in a particularly significant manner: "In what condition soever I am, I beg your Highness to believe, that I shall always continue, with all duty and submission to be as I ought to your Highness."

[308] Dalrymple, Letter of the Earl of Clarendon to the Prince of Orange, May 28, 1687, from London, p. 192 f.

that as his conduct here has been very grateful, so all good men are troubled he stays no longer with us." For this tribute Clarendon was in the good graces of the Prince, and Dykvelt showed a fondness for Clarendon months later after the great enterprise had been enacted.[309]

There were many other letters which Dykvelt carried with him on his return to Holland. Most of them, however, are formal expressions of good-will. They are mostly from men of the Anglican party. In nearly every letter, one is conscious of a restraint. "Dykvelt is able to tell of all that has taken place," is the invariable statement. In the absence of the invaluable personal correspondence of Dykvelt to the Prince,[310] the field thus far is largely one of inference and conjecture.

Dykvelt's Negotiations with Ambassadors of the Allies

An aspect of the mission of Dykvelt, which casts light upon its essential character, is the relationship of the Dutch envoy with the ambassadors of the allied countries in Europe. Here the envoy had a most difficult course to pursue, because the very crux of the situation involved a religious element which struck a blow at the firm union of the continental allies. James used his ingenuity to appeal to the religious interests of Spain and the Empire, but the change in European struggles consequent to the Thirty

[309] *Clarendon and Rochester Correspondence* and *The Diary of Henry Earl of Clarendon*, vol. ii, p. 244 f., esp. 245, 246, 247, 248, and 254.

[310] I have made repeated efforts to find this correspondence. Professor N. Japikse of the Dutch Historical Association very kindly sent me two of Dykvelt's letters to the States General, but he was unable to find any of the private letters of Dykvelt to the Prince of Orange. Macaulay was unable to secure any of these letters.

A recent letter from Professor Kramer, director of the Royal Archives at the Hague, is perhaps salient here:

"Some thirty years ago I myself inquired everywhere after Dijkvelt's manuscripts, and being acquainted with Mr. Van Weede van Dijkveld at Utrecht, I hoped to have a good chance to ascertain what had become of the documents Everaard might have left. I was however disappointed. Mr. Van Weede told me inquiries had been repeatedly made wherever the family papers might possibly be found, but no trace was ever discovered. We agreed about the improbability of Everaard having destroyed his undoubtedly important correspondence and political documents, but the fact remained they had somehow gone astray."

Years' War asserted itself.[311] The struggle continued to be one of balance of power.

At about the time that Dykvelt was making his final preparations for his embassy, Count Kaunitz, the envoy extraordinary of the Emperor, arrived in London.[312] He proceeded at once to make inquiries of the ambassadors of the friendly powers. He interviewed Van Citters, the Dutch ambassador in London, but he did not receive much encouragement. It was his hope—the very purpose of his mission—to try to win over the King of England to the cause of the allies against France.[313] When he suggested this possibility to Van Citters, the latter laughed in his face and told him to go ahead to find out for himself how much was to be attained in foreign affairs with James.[314] On February 6, Kaunitz had his interview with James, but nothing materialized from it.[315]

Don Pedro de Ronquillo, the ambassador of Spain, was greatly influenced by James's offer of opposition to France in return for the repeal of the Test Act and Penal Laws.[316] Dykvelt's temporary approval of the offer of James has already been treated.[317] Ronquillo found it hard to explain Dykvelt's change of opinion regarding religious toleration. The exact negotiations of Dykvelt with the ambassadors have not yet been unfolded. The Editor of Mackintosh suggests that the secret may be learned by a study of the archives at Vienna, Madrid, or the Vatican.[318]

---

[311] During the later years of this war, the struggle was no longer religious but commercial. During these years was born the commercial supremacy of Holland and the intense rivalry that characterized the European situation for the next century.

[312] Klopp, p. 285 f., based on the report of Count Kaunitz of January 31, 1687. Ralph, *History of England*, vol. i, p. 952.

[313] Ralph, idem.

[314] Klopp, p. 286, based on the report of Count Kaunitz of February 3, 1687.

[315] Ibid, p. 286, based on the report of Count Kaunitz of February 7, 1687.

[316] Mackintosh, *Appendix*, Letter of Don Pedro de Ronquillo to the King of Spain, May 26, 1687, from London, p. 691 ff.

[317] Supra, p. 33 f.

[318] Mackintosh, *Continuation*, p. 459.

Ferdinand, Count of Adda, upon the accession of James was sent to London as papal plenipotentiary.[319] His reception was more enthusiastic than he himself had ever expected. The Parliamentary leaders had come most of the way.[320] But James's indiscretions had soon alienated them. And Adda seemed to sympathize with the opponents of James.[321] He saw what a great indiscretion the dismissal of Rochester was. His mission was not primarily religious in nature. There was much friction between the Pope and James. The former did not sympathize with James's jesuitical interests. Nor did he approve of the emissary James had sent to Rome.[322] Castelmaine, James's representative to the Pope, had offended the Pope, and James's Queen drew back in amazement when Adda recounted the emissary's insolence.[323] But the Pope was willing to champion James if the latter would go against France. This was the real purpose of Adda's mission.[324] The Pope realized that James's opinion regarding the Regalia agreed with that of France, and this made him fear that there might be a possible alliance between England and France.[325] To this end he ordered the nuncio Adda to do his best to bring James II to his side; but if the English King proved immovable, Adda was to do all he could to promote the cause of the Revolution, "which had been long before concerted at Rome."[326] Adda realized soon enough that little was to be expected from James, and he joined himself with the other ambassadors against the power of France.

The Last Interview with James II

On May 31 Dykvelt had his last interview with James II.[327]

[319] Ranke, *History of England*, p. 330.

[320] Ibid, idem.

[321] Mackintosh, *History of England*, p. 216, based on letters of Barillon in the Fox collection of March 10, 1687 and June 17, 1686.

[322] Ibid, idem.

[323] Ibid, based on Adda's correspondence of May 23, 1687. The Queen frequently interrupted the narrative by exclamations such as "Jesu e possible."

[324] Clarke, *The Life of James the Second, King of England*, vol. ii, p. 117.

[325] Ibid, idem.

[326] Ibid, idem.

[327] Kennet, *A Complete History of England*, vol. iii, p. 456.

It was a lively meeting. James was not ignorant of Dykvelt's constant negotiations, but he was willing to overlook all that Dykvelt had done if he could but get the Prince to acquiesce in his religious policy.[328] He pressed his demand for the Prince's consent to the repeal of the Test Act. He spoke with firmness and vivacity. He was intent on the repeal. And he did not hesitate to say that he would dissolve Parliament as soon as he saw that it was impossible to obtain his desires.[329] He would dissolve any Parliament that stood in opposition to him. He reproached Dykvelt severely for his interviews with the most factious elements in England. But Dykvelt defended himself admirably. He did not deny that he had spoken to "the most considerable personnages in England," but he had done it in order to render to the Prince a more correct account of the real feelings of the country. "It is for that very thing that I have permitted myself to speak to you as I have done," he continued, "but I am an honest fellow, and I am incapable of having taken with them any union which could bring prejudice to the interests of your majesty."[330]

Dykvelt certainly had every reason to believe that he had incurred the King's resentment. But James, in his letter to the Prince at the time of Dykvelt's departure, made no complaints against the envoy.[331] In the letter he besought the Prince to agree to what he had asked of Dykvelt. It was for the good of the monarchy and "of our own family." And he adds quite significantly:

> And though, may be, some persons, that are not well affected to me, nor the government, have misrepresented some things to him and find fault with my proceedings in several things, yet I am satisfied I have not made one step, but what is good for the kingdom in general, as well as for the monarchy, and have more reason every day than other to be pleased with having put out my declaration for liberty of conscience.

---

[328] Mackintosh, *Appendix*, Letter of Adda to the Pope, June 20, 1687, p. 640. Quoted also in Klopp, p. 328.

[329] Ranke, *History of England*, vol. iv, p. 329 f.

[330] Mazure, vol. ii, p. 255.

[331] Dalrymple, Letter from King James to the Prince of Orange, May 28, 1687, from Windsor, p. 183.

While Dykvelt was getting ready to return to Holland, James II was preparing memorials for Albeville, which were to be presented to the Prince and to the Princess separately.[332] But when Albeville presented the letter from his master, the Prince and the Princess expressed themselves more enthusiastically than ever "with a tone of resentment which excluded all reasonable hope."[333] At this time Avaux was acting with Albeville to draw France and England into a close alliance, but again he met with resistance, for the Prince listened with eagerness to the reports of Dykvelt.[334] James II himself ascribed the Prince's conduct to the influence brought to bear through Dykvelt of the factious leaders of the opposition in England.[335] And when the Prince of Orange repeated his sentiments against the repeal of the Test Act and Penal Laws in his letter of June 17,[336] the King was enraged, and told of Dykvelt's dealings with the opposition.[337] The close of the letter is interesting, for it is no longer "I shall be as kind to you as you can *desire*," as all the previous letters ended, but it is now "I shall be as kind to you as you can *expect*." (The italics are mine.)

After the departure of Dykvelt there was a period of quiet in England.[338] It was the quiet that precedes a storm. A study of the letters in Dalrymple from the first of June, 1687, to the sending of the invitation on June 30, 1688, shows a gradual culmination of affairs in England. Very shortly after Dykvelt's return to the Hague, William sent Count Zuliestein to England on a mission of condolence to the queen at the death of her mother.[339] Zuliestein was not nearly so strong a diplomat as Dykvelt,[340] and the letters

[332] Avaux, *Négociations*, June 12, 1687, p. 53 f.

[333] Mazure, p. 257.

[334] Avaux, *Négociations*, June 12, 1687, p. 54; June 19, 1687, p. 55.

[335] Dalrymple, Letter from King James to the Prince of Orange, May 28, 1687, from Windsor, p. 183.

[336] Ibid, Letter from the Prince of Orange to King James, June 17, 1687, p. 184 f.

[337] Ibid, Letter from King James to the Prince of Orange, June 27, 1687, from Windsor, p. 185.

[338] Ibid, Letter from Lord Halifax to the Prince of Orange, August 25, 1687, from London, p. 207 f.

[339] Burnet, p. 479.

[340] Macaulay, *History of England*, vol. ii, p. 906.

which he carried with him on his return are only the direct result of the culminating influences wrought by the labors of Dykvelt.[341] These letters of the leaders to the Prince show a growth in daring and conviction. In September, Shrewsbury came over to Holland, and he bore with him letters from the leaders most of which leave it to Shrewsbury to tell by word of mouth what their sentiments are toward the Prince. Early in the next year Russell crossed the Channel, and besought the Prince to come to the aid of the people of England. The Prince showed some resolution at this time, and he repeated his famous words, "Nunc aut nunquam." Mordaunt had been in Holland since 1686.[342] Others gradually joined the English cabal in Holland. When the Prince entered Torbay on that memorable day in November, he was surrounded by a strong party of English supporters.[343]

A Final Estimate

The mission of Dykvelt to England in 1687 stands out, then, because it represents the beginning of the offensive against James II. It is important because of the dexterity with which the envoy was able to rally all the parties to the cause of the Prince. The brilliancy of the work is all the more manifest from the obscurity under which he was forced to labor. Another disturbing factor was the great animosity that existed between the various

---

[341] These letters may be found in Dalrymple's *Appendix*, pp. 200–210.

Burnet's statement that Zuliestein brought the Prince such positive advices and such an assurance of the invitation the Prince had desired is quite obviously incorrect. In the first place, Zuliestein was in England but three weeks (Dalrymple, p. 200) and possessed little of the aggressiveness of Dykvelt. Moreover, the English leaders were already sending their representatives over to William in person. Again, the time when the Prince seems first to have signified directly his willingness to come to England was early in the year 1688 at the arrival of Russell. Finally, Burnet characteristically takes a tremendous leap in time when in the very next sentence he speaks of the proceedings against the Bishops. He says the whole nation was in fermentation. Surely not, at the time of Zuliestein's embassy! Halifax tells us differently, and he was on the spot.

[342] Grimblot's Letters, Note 3, p. 352.

Burnet, p. 495.

[343] Burnet, pp. 495–503.

political and religious parties. Yet the Tories were as enthusiastic in their reception of William as the Whigs, and the Nonconformists were willing to forget all past injuries for a greater good. Dykvelt was a past master in the art of conciliation, and he knew when to speak and when to keep quiet. When the Catholics came to him with specific demands, he remained calm. The natural course of events and the constant warning of Dykvelt of French aggression made a split in the Catholic ranks. Of characteristic Dutch temper, Dykvelt was not easily cowed. At the reproach of the King, he defended himself nobly. He entered into designs with those most closely attached to the King. The army and the navy, the court and the national Parliament, and even the King's household were profoundly influenced by the negotiations of Dykvelt. All the indications of this period are that Dykvelt organized the great movement against the arbitrary government of James II, and through his negotiations with the English leaders helped in a large measure to bring about a new period in English history. Little wonder that it was suggested to erect a statue in his memory for his efforts in bringing about the great enterprise of the Revolution of 1688!

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A. Manuscript Sources

1. Everaard Van Weede, *Secret Letter to the Secretary of the States General*, March 4, 1687, from London, Rijksarchief, 'sgravenhage, 7335.
2. Everaard Van Weede, *Public Letter to the States General*, March 4, 1687, from London, Rijksarchief, 'sgravenhage, 6929.

Note: I am indebted to Professor Japikse of the Dutch Historical Society for the above letters.

B. Printed Sources

1. Avaux, Monsieur le Comte (Jean Antoine de Mesnes), *Négociations en Hollande depuis 1679 jusqu'en 1688*, 6 vols., Paris, 1752.

The artful and designing character of Count Avaux is everywhere apparent in this work. He was exceedingly active and loyal to his master, Louis XIV. He always suspected something sinister in his dealings with others, and he was quick to grasp the motives and intentions of those with whom he dealt. He was incredulous. His view and understanding of 'the English business' was accurate and more correct than that of Barillon, the French ambassador in London.

His *Négociations* is not a journal although it appears throughout that it was the intention of the writer to pass it to his readers as such. The narrative runs as though written on the day of the incidents mentioned. It is true the dates are given in the margin, but the material included under each date often contains expressions such as 'aujourdhui,' 'hier,' 'pendant les dix derniers jours,' which indicate the chronological order of writing.[1]

There are two or three places in the six volumes where Avaux forgets himself and refers to events which had not yet occurred at the time of the date governing the passage.[2] Moreover, it is very clear that the *Négociations* is a narrative based upon the correspondence of Avaux. There are frequent and abundant references to letters, the date and the person writing or written to being given in each case. This would give the *Négociations* a position superior to a memoir.

But another consideration, admirably noted by the editor of the *Archief Hensius*, reminds us that Avaux was not honest, but was guilty "at least once of

---

[1] Tome v, 162, 290, 298, 314.
Tome vi, 34, 33, 42, 185, 253.

[2] Tome v, 291. Sans doute le Prince avait alors en vue l'enterprise qu'il a faite depuis contre l'Angleterre.

Tome vi, 28. Le Sieur Dickveld fut envoyé sous le prétexte de s'éclaircir de tout ce qui est dit ci-dessus, et témoigner à S. M. Britanique le désir qu'avaient les États Généraux de vivre avec Elle dans une parfaite amitié et correspondance: mais en effet pour fomenter le soulèvement qu'on a vu depuis.

writing to the Court of things which had not yet taken place!"[3] His diplomatic methods were base, and he resorted to the meanest bribery to gain his ends.

The *Négociations*, then, as Vander Heim points out in his introduction to the *Archief Hensius*, must be accepted with great care.

2. Burnet, Gilbert, *History of His Own Time*, (from the Restoration of Charles II to the Treaty of Peace at Utrecht in the Reign of Queen Anne), London, 1838.

Ranke has criticized Burnet's *History of His Own Time* in his *History of England*, vol. vi. The following paragraphs summarize his work, and especially his treatment of the Revolution:

> "Burnet's *History of His Own Time* is above all things a noting of what was remarkable in his own life. It is a strange mixture of rumour and error with knowledge and truth, of credulous impartiality and the effort to be impartial;—subjective truthfulness one cannot dispute in our author; but the objective of the facts which he handles one must often deny.
>
> "This is especially the case in his account of the reign of James II, of which, being out of England, he was not an eye-witness, and only knew the events by report at second-hand, as they spread about in all the world by James' enemies. . . . His narrative becomes more untrustworthy and partial in proportion as the events gain in importance.
>
> . . . . . .
>
> "Although we are obliged in this as in so many points to set aside Burnet's report of what took place in England, *yet on the other hand his account of his stay at the Hague is invaluable.* . . . Burnet's report of the preparations of the Prince of Orange for his English expedition is by no means entirely sufficient, but still it is the best that we have left from the period itself."

---

[3] Vander Heim, *Het Archief van den Raadpensionaris Antonie Heinsius*, Introduction, lviii, note

Wat d'Avaux zelf in zijn uitgeven *Négociations* vermeldt moet met groote omsichtigheit worden aangenomen. Hij zelf verklaarde, toen zijne brieven onderschept werden, dat hij wel eens aan zijn hof meldde wat noch niet geschied was. In 1692–1697 was d'Avaux in Zweden. Van Heeckeren, onze gezant aldaar, schreef toen eens aan Hensius (April 20, 1694) hoe het bleek dat Avaux aan zijn hof raaporten deed over staatslieden, die hij met geld hat gewonnen, en van geheime brieven, die hij ontving, zonder dat er een woord waarheid in was.

For a careful and exhaustive criticism of Burnet's *History*, see H. C. Foxcroft, Supplement to Burnet's *History of His Own Time*, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1902. Foxcroft had access to all three of the famous manuscripts of Burnet.. References to Burnet's *History* should be compared with the valuable corrections of Foxcroft in his *Supplement*. The *Supplement* is derived from Burnet's Original Memoirs, his Autobiography, his Letters to Admiral Herbert, and his Private Meditations.

3. Dalrymple, Sir John, *Memoirs of Great Britain and Ireland* (from the Dissolution of the last Parliament of Charles the Second until the Sea-Battle off La Hogue), Second Edition, 3 vols., London and Edinburgh, 1771.

Dalrymple was given access to the correspondence in the famous Kensington cabinet. His Volume 2 is the most valuable source I have found for a study of the period covering the English Revolution. The letters of James II to the Prince of Orange, the letters incident to the embassy of Dykvelt, and the intriguing correspondence between the English leaders and the Prince are the invaluable sources for a study of this period.

Contents:

Volume II, Part I. Letters carried by Monsieur Dykvelt to the Prince of Orange from Lord Halifax, Lady Sunderland, Lord Churchill, Colonel Bellasys; the Lords Sunderland, Nottingham, Clarendon, Rochester; Mr. Fitzpatrick; the Lords Danby, Devonshire, Shrewsbury, Sir George McKenzie, the Bishop of London, and the old Earl of Bedford, which contain the intrigues of Dykvelt in England, in the summer of the year, 1687, for bringing about the revolution; pp. 180–200.

Letters carried by Count Zuliestein to the Prince of Orange, from the Lords Mordaunt, Nottingham, Danby, Halifax, and the Bishop of London, which contain the intrigues of Count Zuliestein in England, in the autumn of 1687, for the same purpose; pp. 200–210.

Letters from Devonshire, Lady Sunderland, the Bishop of London, the Lords Shrewsbury, Danby, and Halifax; pp. 210–222.

Letters from the leaders of the Parliamentary party and others which follow closely until the summer of 1688, thus giving an accurate portrayal of the succession of events until the revolution. pp. 224–229.

Two letters of Halifax in December, 1686, to the Prince of Orange.

Correspondence between James II and the Prince of Orange.

4. Ellis, John, *Correspondence*, (written during the years 1686, 1687, 1688, and addressed to John Ellis, Esq.), Edited by George Agar Ellis, 2 vols., London, 1829. Unfortunately, the writers of these letters are not given.
5. Evelyn, John, *Diary and Correspondence*, Edward W. Bray, Life by H. B. Wheatley, 3 vols., London, 1879.
6. Foxcroft, H. C., *The Life and Letters of Sir George Saville, First Marquis of Halifax*, 2 vols., London, 1898.

This work gains its value from its painstaking annotation and its most rigid attention to evidence. The critical point of view of the author and compiler is marked throughout.

7. Mackintosh, Sir James, *History of the Revolution in England in 1688*, The Appendix, Philadelphia, 1835.

Correspondence of the papal nuncio D'Adda and several letters of Don Ronquillo, the Spanish ambassador. See below for critical estimate of the *History*.

8. Russell, Rachel Lady, *Letters*, 2 vols., London, 1853.

C. Secondary Works

1. Cambridge Modern History, Planned by Lord Acton, Edited by A. W. Ward, G. W. Prothero, and Stanley Leathes, vol. v., *The Age of Louis XIV.*

The important chapters in this volume are:

Chapter VII, "Administration of De Witt and William of Orange," Rev. George Edmundson, 137–168.

Chapter IX, "The Policy of Charles II and James II," John Pollock, 198–236.

Chapter X, "The Revolution and the Revolutionary Settlement," H. W. V. Temperley, 236–324.

2. De Grovestins, Sirtema, *Guillaume et Louis XIV, Histoire des Luttes et Rivalités Politiques entre les Puissances Maritimes et la France dans la dernière moitié du XVIIe siecle*, 8 vols., Paris, 1868.

3. Dictionary of National Biography, "William III," A. W. Ward.

4. Fruin, Robert, *Verspreide Geschriften*, vol. v, Edited by Dr. P. J. Blok, Dr. P. L. Müller, Mr. S. Müller, 'sgravenhage, 1902.

The clear, forceful exposition of this work and its careful interpretation make it of particular value. The contents of the volume are as follows:

Prins Willem III in zijn verhouding tot Engeland

Maria, de gemalin van Prins Willem III

Uit de nagelaten papieren van Van de Spiegel

De jongelingsjaren van Gijsbert Karel van Hogendorp

Gijsbert Karel van Hogendorp in November, 1813

Mevrouw Bilderdijk—Woesthoven en haar slachtoffer.

5. Hallam, Henry, *Constitutional History of England*, 3 vols., New York, 1870.

6. Kennett, Bishop, *A Complete History of England*, London, 1706.

Bishop Kennett quotes many interesting sources which are valuable for the period of the Revolution. Often the historian finds mention of sources in his book which have been lost for many years.

7. Klopp, Onno, *Der Fall des Hauses Stuart* (und die Succession des Hauses Hanover in Grosz-Britannien und Ireland im Zusammenhange der europaischen Angelegenheiten von 1666–1714), 14 vols., Wien, 1876.

This work is considered "by far the most elaborate survey and vindication as a whole of the European policy of William III." A. W. Ward, in his biography of William III in the Dictionary of National Biography, calls Klopp's work monumental. Certainly, it is a well-established work. The sources are of the best. Klopp had at his disposal the correspondence of the representatives of the Pope, Louis the Fourteenth, the Emperor, and the King of Spain at the court of James II as well as the 'Berichten' of the imperial representative at the Hague and the vast Dutch political correspondence. The careful exposition and the critical attitude of the author give this work a high rank in the historical literature for the period.

8. Macaulay, Thomas B., *History of England*, Edited by Charles Harding Firth, 6 vols., London, 1915.

Macaulay used the important collection of documents and letters of Sir James Mackintosh, but his use of them subjects him to the criticism of partiality and party prejudice.

9. Mackintosh, Sir James, *History of the Revolution in England in 1688, and completed to the settlement of the crown*, by the Editor, Philadelphia, 1835.

Mackintosh had at his disposal the correspondence of the papal nuncio in England, the French ambassador, the Spanish ambassador, and a vast number of the letters of the leaders in England. Besides, there is a large group of documents and miscellaneous letters with which he had thorough acquaintance. The Dutch Archives were open to him, and he uses the extremely interesting Dutch political correspondence to great advantage throughout his work.

But it is to the Editor of Mackintosh's *History* that the investigator owes his enthusiastic gratitude. He has taken the sources of Mackintosh and has developed the several episodes of the Revolutionary undertaking with precision. A concluding paragraph in the introduction is quite indispensable to an understanding of the use of this work:

> "In the continuation, it will be observed that the glimpses of opinion on the character of the Revolution, and on the characters and motives of the chief persons who figured in it, do not always agree with the views of Sir James Mackintosh. But it should not be forgotten, that Sir James was avowedly and emphatically a Whig of the Revolution,—and that, since the agitation of Religious Liberty and Parliamentary Reform became a national movement, the great transaction of 1688 has been more dispassionately, more correctly, and less highly estimated. The writer of the Continuation believed himself unbiassed by any predilection for either Whigs or Tories, and not only borne out but bound by the facts. He felt in fine that his first duty to the reader and to himself was good faith."

10. Mazure, F. A. J., *Histoire de la Revolution de 1688 en Angleterre*, 3 vols., Paris, 1848.

Mazure's account of the Revolution and the steps leading to the Revolution gains consideration from his constant and elaborate use of the records and letters of Barillon, Bonrepaux, and others concerned in the Anglo-French diplomacy of this period.

11. Müller, P. L. (Editor), *Wilhelm III von Oranien und Georg Friedrich von Waldeck*, 2 vols., Haag, 1893.

The letters of the Prince of Orange and his famous general do not directly concern the period covered in the thesis, but they are very illuminating for an understanding of William's European politics. The introduction to these letters gives an admirable survey of the period just preceding the Revolution.

12. Nyevelt, Baron Suzette Van Zuylen van, *Court Life in the Dutch Republic, 1638–1689*, London and New York, 1906.

13. Oldmixon, John, *History of England during the Reigns of the Royal House of Stuart*, London, 1730.

This history follows the account of Burnet very closely. There is little evidence of a critical consciousness.

14. Ralph, *History of England*, 1744, London.

15. Ranke, Leopold von, *History of England, principally in the Seventeenth Century*, English Translation, 6 vols., Oxford, 1875.

Ranke's work is marked by a critical point of view. It is consequently a careful study. The criticism of Müller that Ranke pays too much attention to the English side of the struggle in his history is well taken.

16. Rapin, de Thoyras, *History of England*, 15 vols., Dublin, 1732.

17. Traill, H. D., *William the Third*, London, 1915.
This is a good short biography of the Prince of Orange

18. Vander Heim, H. J., *Het Archief van den Raadpensionaris Antonie Heinsius*, 3 vols., 'sgravenhage, 1880. The Introduction.

19. Van Praet, Jules, *Essaies sur l'Histoire Politique des Derniers Siecles*, Guillaume III, Bruxelles, 1867.

20. Van Praet, Jules, *Essaies sur l'Histoire Politique des Derniers Siecles*, Le Traite d'Utrecht et les Négociations antérieures de Louis XIV, Bruxelles, 1874.

21. Wolseley, General Viscount, *The Life of John Churchill, Duke of Marlborough*, (to the accession of Queen Anne), 2 vols., London, 1894.

This is a sympathetic and well-written account of the life of Churchill. It gives many glimpses of court life, and affords an interesting interpretation upon the life of Anne and her teacher.

22. Wagenaar, *Vaderlandsche Historie*, 21 vols., Amsterdam, 1756.

The constant use of the vast Dutch Political Correspondence and the Register and Proceedings of the States General makes this work of importance for the account of the Revolution.

23. Lingard, John, *History of England (to the accession of William and Mary in 1688)*, 10 vols., London, 1855.

Volumes I-XIX of UNIVERSITY STUDIES are each complete in four numbers.
Index and title page are furnished for each volume.
Single numbers (excepting Vol. II, No. 3) may be had for 75 cents each.
A few copies of Volumes I-XIX, complete in numbers, are still to be had.
All communications regarding purchase or exchange should be addressed to

THE UNIVERSITY OF NEBRASKA LIBRARY

LINCOLN, NEB., U. S. A.

The Collegiate Press
GEORGE BANTA PUBLISHING COMPANY
MENASHA, WIS.

NH
V.20(3-4)

SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION LIBRARIES
3 9088 00876 4136